

HENRY GEORGE. EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

RAPID TRANSIT

The difference between the operating of the railways which have become of such vital importance to our great cities, and the functions that can safely be left to private individuals or corporations, is that the former are in their nature monopolies, and

The main reason why Mayor Hewitt proposes to call in the great Vanderbilt corporation to build and to run roads that are to be paid for by the city, is that this corporation already owns important transit facilities. "We must," says Mayor Hewitt, "recognize the fact that access by rail to the city of New York is practically controlled by the New York Central and Hudson river railroad company, and that the city has expended the sum of three million dollars in furnishing this company with depressed tracks so that rapid transit might be secured north of the Grand Central depot." After this same company shall have built, even though at public expense,

The mayor in his, though perhaps enormous powers. The contract which little clumsily, recognizes the impropriety are to make on the part of the city is fact that the increase in land values caused reality probably the most liberal donay by such public improvements as he urges even made to a railroad company since will far more than pay for them. The general government gave to the figures he gives are significant. Erectors of the Pacific railroads lands estimates the cost of the very exd bonds enough, not only to build the pensive road he proposes from Fort-ads, but to make many great fortunes second street to the city hall, includingsides. This lodgment of power is not to rights of way, etc., at \$10,000,000. But objected to, for power must be lodged an increase of land values, which wouldwether if anything is to be done, and give to the city an increased net revenueexperience shows that there is less danger of \$4,000,000, would thus permit the corruption where the concentration of payment of interest, at three per cent.ministrative power brings clear respon- \$133,000,000! Practically there is noility than where the division of power limit to the amount of money that New divides responsibility that it rests on York can afford to spend in public imrove clearly. But when they are to have provements that will make the city ch power and to assume such responsi- more desirable place to live in, a betteity, why should the representatives of the place to do business in. The return wily be required to make contracts for the come quickly in increased power of raisingilding of the road with an intermediary revenue; in the growth of that fund tharporation, which is in its turn to con- belongs of right to the whole community with other contractors? And though

Mayor Hewitt proposes to give the board enormous powers. The contract which they are to make on the part of the city is in fact reality probably the most liberal donagonever even made to a railroad company since the general government gave to the directors of the Pacific railroads lands and bonds enough, not only to build the roads, but to make many great fortunes besides. This lodgment of power is not to be objected to, for power must be lodged somewhere if anything is to be done, and experience shows that there is less danger of the corruption where the concentration of administrative power brings clear responsibility than where the division of power divides responsibility that it rests nowhere clearly. But when they are to have such power and to assume such responsibility, why should the representatives of the city be required to make contracts for the building of the road with an intermediary corporation, which is in its turn to contract with other contractors? And though

In concluding the message to the board of aldermen in which he broached his rapid transit scheme, Mayor Hewitt touched upon the tenement house problem, declaring that it could only be solved by cheap rapid transit. "Nothing so effective for the relief of those who live by their daily labor can be devised as the creation of cheap rapid transit to those portions of the city where land is plenty and the surroundings healthful and attractive. The system of separate dwellings for each family alone realizes the true ideal of home life."

But if the value of land increases, as the mayor says it does, with the rapidity of the transit, and also, as he certainly will concede, with the cheapness of the transit, how is cheap, rapid transit to those por-

Speculative value would not keep ahead of the growth of real value, and that worst and most injurious form of gambling—the "real estate boom"—would become impossible. The increase in the utility of land, still less the prospective increase in its utility, would not mean increase in its value. Even when land became valuable by reason of the demand not to *own*, but to *use* it, the man who wanted to use a piece would not have to diminish his capital by paying for its value in a purchasing price, but would simply have to pay an annual tax. Even in a place where such

an improvement as rapid transit had given land greater utility, so long as vacant lots yet abounded, the man who wanted to build a house would have nothing, or but a nominal price to pay for his lot, and nothing or but a nominal tax to pay upon it. As for the house, not only would its materials be free from tax, but the erection of a house, no matter how good, would bring upon builder or user no fine in increased taxation. Under these conditions not only would it be easy for thousands and thousands of men who now cannot dream of such a thing, to build themselves homes; but capitalists, though they could no longer find profitable investment in buying land and holding it for a rise, could find profitable investment in building houses and selling them outright or by installments at a reasonable profit on the mere cost of the building.

And then, not only would the abolition of all the taxes that provoke to perjury, put a premium upon fraud and teach men to rob, lie and cheat, improve the public morals; but the general comfort and the cessation of the fear of poverty that would come with the opening of natural opportunities to labor, and the consequent larger production and fairer distribution of wealth, would render men less greedy and grasping, and indispose them to measure success in life by what a man can leave when life ends. Thus we should come to admire character more than riches, and to wish rather to be thought honest and true than to be thought wealthy. And then we should begin to trust in each other, and not to fear that every great public work must involve great stealing, but to believe that we could readily find men who would manage great public trusts as faithfully as a private business. We should find them in plenty; for there are far more such men even now than many people and many newspapers seem to think. And thus should we get rid of not the least of the difficulties which now lie in the way of the undertaking by the community of things that would be for the benefit of the whole community.

I do not for a moment imagine that a beginning in the work of providing rapid transit facilities for New York ought to be delayed till the single tax is adopted. But neither ought it to be begun until well thought out and discussed. It seems probable that Mayor Hewitt has proposed this patchwork scheme, not as what he would wish, but as the best that public opinion is ripe for. If this be so, and he will withdraw this scheme and propose instead a plan by which the city shall build a road to be owned and operated by the city for the free use of the people, the necessary expenses of building and maintenance to be defrayed by a special tax levied on land values alone, he will be surprised by the manner in which public opinion will rally to his support.

And through the future he will stand to the world's metropolis that is waiting here the offspring successor of that DeWitt Clinton, to whose far sighted statesmanship New York owes the first great impulse to her growth.

The single tax idea is progressing every day with accelerating rapidity, and it is progressing not merely directly, but, as the history of all such movements should lead us to expect, by diffusion. Our thought is leavening the lump where it is not recognized as ours, and our principles are being adopted by thousands who know us only by misrepresentation believe us "cranks" and "anarchists." On the fourth page of THE STANDARD will be found a letter from August Lewis, mailed just before he sailed for Europe last Saturday in the Etruria, and inclosing a note which is both instructive and amusing. But Mr. Lewis's teacher-friend's pupils are not the only ones who are astonished to find that they are "single tax cranks." A companion letter comes from the west.

The following most excellent single tax article is clipped from the Brule Index, published at Kimball, Dakota, in that very part of the country where, according to the Chicago Tribune and papers of that sort, the working farmers will fight before they will permit the taxation of land values irrespective of improvements to rob them of their all, and hurl them from their present most prosperous and contented condition to one in which they will have to work hard for a bare living. There is not a reader of THE STANDARD that will not hail in Mr. Thorndike and Major Edwards able and efficient friends of our cause:

Major Edwards, that well known editor of Fargo, makes the statement that taxing the improvements upon a quarter section is simply offering a premium upon laziness and non-progressive farmers, and suggests, as a better tax to the assessors' laws, that every quarter section be taxed the same. If the major means—and of course he does—that the location only of the land shall cause a variation in assessing, then this suggestion is one that should take root in the next session of the Dakota legislature and flourish and bear good fruit. The moment an energetic farmer takes hold of an unimproved quarter section and begins to make improvements, just so quickly does the amount of his taxes increase. The quarters adjoining his—totally unimproved, and craving no aheadativeness! Suppose a man gets hold of a quarter-section whose adjoining quarters are owned by some investment company who have secured them during or closely following a poor crop year.

Possessed of a little means and a large amount of grit, push, pluck, whatever term you may give it, he works hard and by steady work and careful engineering he, in a couple of years, succeeds in putting on a couple of thousand dollars' worth of improvements. The "company land," meantime, lies idle, and the diminutive amount of taxes each year is forthcoming because "the company is rich and its faith in the country unlimited." The go-ahead farmer's taxes have now troubled, or perhaps the assessor may advance them even more and the owner remonstrates. But there is no "balm in Gilead." If he desires to sell there is the drawback that "the other farms in the locality are poor"—no improvements—no nothing—and he must depreciate his selling figures. On the other hand should the "company" desire to dispose of a quarter section it will be shown that it lies next to one of the best and most extensively improved farms in the country, and can be made to realize a very large percentage more than if the improved farm was elsewhere. All this shows what? That certainly our laws in regard to assessing valuation are crude, or that it is desired that the main portion of the taxes shall be paid by that class of men described by "Josh Billings," as:

He who bi farmin wood git rich
Must so ar, plo an dig an ditch;
Work hard and al—sleep hard awl nite,
Save every sent—an no git cwe!
It is unjust—unfair—and partial. Let location, quality of soil, whatever you will, determine the value of the farm, but don't burden a pushing farmer who desires to build up his neighborhood. Lighten his taxes, proportionately, if you desire, or let them remain, as we suggest, the same; but don't increase them.

Here is the letter in which this editorial from the Brule Index comes to me. It is from James Brown, who, as I see by the letter head, is of the firm of Moyer & Brown, attorneys-at-law:

KIMBALL, Dakota, March 17.—Mr. Henry George, New York City: I inclose you a clipping from one of our local papers—The Brule Index. The editor of the Index, like many more in the world, has a very positive notion that Henry George is a "crank," who wants to abolish all taxation on real estate and turn society in general upside down. For myself I cannot say but that until recently I had not much better information as to your teachings. But lately an acquaintance has loaned me occasionally a copy of THE STANDARD with the request that I read it. I have read and got new light as to both Henry Georgeism and also as to the land and labor question. I have just got your book, "Progress and Poverty," but have not yet begun to read it. Last night, on reading the enclosed editorial, it struck me that there was considerable "Georgeism" in it. I went and told the editor so and he was astonished and shocked to think that he had in any degree approached your ideas. He could not believe it possible. I told him I would send him editorial to you and ask you to make a brief comment on it in THE STANDARD, pointing out wherein, if at all, it approaches or embraces the principles you teach in regard to land and taxation.

I have also bought your "Protection or Free Trade?" and will begin studying that in my reading hours. If you will make a brief comment as requested in the first number of THE STANDARD in which you can spare space for such a trifle, you will confer a favor on me.

Yours respectfully, JAMES BROWN.

Mr. Thorndike is for all practical purposes a good enough single tax man for us.

HENRY GEORGE.

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE TARIFF. Mr. Teller, in addressing the United States senate on the president's message last week, declared that Mr. Cleveland and his friends have not engaged in an attack on a defective tariff with a view to remedying inconsistencies and defects, but that they have sought to destroy the protective system as "vicious, inequitable and illogical." Mr. Teller quoted Senator Colquitt's declaration that the democratic party has always been a free trade party, and then, strangely enough, undertook to combat the statement, though, as a republican, it would seem to be to his interest to prove it true.

Mr. Teller traveled over the beaten ground in his speech, which was based on the usual protectionist assumption that protection is synonymous with patriotism, and that any attack on it is treasonable, or, as William D. Kelley puts it, "revolutionary." He offered no proof that free trade would be injurious, and made no real argument in favor of his own theory, and the only thing of interest in his speech is his attempt to present Grover Cleveland to congress as the first democratic free trader, and one who in this respect differs widely, and to his great discredit, from all of his democratic predecessors in the presidential chair. A young Philadelphia woman once started out to lecture on the future destiny of our republic, and began her address with the declaration that with all that had occurred in American history before 1861 we have nothing to do. Senator Teller appears to belong to the same school of historical research.

The most cursory study of our political history would have taught Senator Teller that many former presidents have uttered more radical free trade opinions than can be found in Mr. Cleveland's message, and that the Tilden platform of 1876 was by no means the first democratic declaration in favor of a tariff for revenue only. In the earlier days of the republic the custom of making formal declarations of principle at the beginning of each campaign did not exist, and the nearest approach to a modern platform to be found in the declaration of principles made by the congressional caucus that nominated Thomas Jefferson before his first election. That caucus declared for "free commerce with all nations, political connection with none, and little or no diplomatic establishment." Thenceforward there was no further formal enunciation of principles until 1836, the declarations made by the presidents in their messages being usually accepted as the utterances of the party. When Martin Van Buren was nominated in 1836 a platform was adopted, but the tariff was not then an issue, and the platform was chiefly devoted to denouncing the legislative creation of monopolies and vested rights, and it declared the sound doctrine that "every law or act of

incorporation passed by the preceding legislatures can be rightfully altered or repealed by their successors."

Thenceforward it became the custom to make platforms, and that of 1840 declared that "no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the government." In 1844 this platform was reaffirmed. The convention of 1848 repeated in its platform the exact words of that of 1840, but added after the word "government," and for the gradual but certain extinction of the debt created by the prosecution of a just and necessary war." In 1852 the tariff plank as amended in 1849 was adopted without change, and it was reaffirmed in the elaborate platform of 1856, on which stood the last democratic candidate elected before the civil war. The party split in 1860, but both conventions reaffirmed that portion of the platform of 1856, which included the tariff plank as amended in 1844, so that it is a historical fact that the unbroken policy of the democratic party from 1840 to 1860 was that of a tariff for revenue only.

The convention of 1864, which made its famous declaration about the "four years of failure to restore the union by the exclusive of war," confined itself exclusively to the war issues, as did also the republican convention held the same year. In the platform of 1868 there is a confused declaration in favor of "a tariff for revenue" and such internal revenue laws "as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures," while the convention of 1872, which nominated Horace Greeley, remitted the question to the people of the several congressional districts. In 1876 the party came back to its ancient faith, and after severely denouncing the existing tariff, demanded "that all custom house taxation shall be for revenue only," and the convention of 1880 reaffirmed the declaration of 1876. Thus it will be seen that, except during the period of its demoralization during and after the civil war, the democratic party has maintained unbroken its affirmation that "no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the government," and has never repudiated the declaration made in the Jefferson campaign for free commerce with all nations. Senator Teller is therefore greatly mistaken in saying that Mr. Cleveland is the first free trade democratic president and that the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only was never heard of in a democratic platform until 1876.

The truth is that the party's professions in this matter have for a long time been far better than its performance, and the present effort in congress to really reduce the tariff is the least that honest democrats could assent to, even in view of the platform of 1884, the tariff plank in which is one of the poorest the party has ever adopted. If we could have any assurance that the party would live up to its pastwages we might readily trust it to against employer to secure the workman's service. Alms houses, tenement houses, dime lodging houses, soup charities—all these are towns only by tradition. The poorest man who occupies a house of his own and maintains a family in ease and comfort, England and many have their tramps, wandering from sea to place, at first in search of work, but ally as mere pariahs of civilization, but so ever heard of a tramp in the United States? Why, it is actually difficult to make school children understand that there was a time when men begged for the village of work, and women and their little were forced to toil for bread. Such is glorious condition in which we find ourselves after only a quarter of a century of freedom. And shall we risk the loss of so advantages? Forbid it, heaven!

And so on, and so on. The rest of the speech can be adapted to the audience, the ringing in allusions to local industries and advantages as may be necessary. A speech couldn't fail to be effective, would not only gratefully tickle the ears of those who are already protectionists, it might even have a very considerable effect in converting free trade enemies from the error of their ways. In it, it's the sort of speech that ought to be made. As for the fact that it's a mere neg of nonsensical untruths—why, if Whitman is going to make that objection, we greatly fear that he will have given up the making of protectionist eches altogether.

FALSE LABELS ON TWADDLE.

Mrs. John Sherwood discusses in a wide-published article the important question "How to properly conduct a fashionable party nowadays." This is a subject which many who ardently wish to give a fashionable dinner parties probably greeted competent instructions; but if their attention demands minute direction in details we fear that they will find little but appointment in Mrs. Sherwood's article. She insists that the art of entertaining is a that may be cultivated, but can not be wired. What hope is there in this for women who most keenly long to give social distinction in this line, but lacks the inspiration that Mrs. Sherwood insists must accompany the aspiration? From a somewhat cursory examination of this lady's treatment of what she perily calls "a social problem," we are to fear that she writes for the sake of being, rather than from the consciousness of possession of an important truth to which she must give form and expression. This surmise is well founded. Mrs. Sherwood does not differ greatly from other writers who attempt to discuss a more ambitious fashion the far greater problem—how are people to get dinner of any kind? Bishop J. L. Spalding, instance, in the current number of the Social Life Threatened? The good op rambles over the whole field, gently stating that prohibition will not accomplish all that its advocates hope for, mild-protecting that the wrath of capital

vote themselves to some special industry or collection of industries, and it takes the things produced at that place and carries them to some other place where different circumstances have developed other industries, and there exchanges one class of goods for the other, bringing back the products of the second place to enrich the first, and vice versa. Thus it transports the coal of Pennsylvania to New York, and takes back the silks, satins, furniture, and bric-a-brac wherewith the beneficently protected coal miners adorn their persons and their homes. It carries the steel of Andrew Carnegie westward, and the beef and pork of Phil Armour eastward in exchange. The Standard oil trust sends kerosene southward in its cars, and another trust loads the same cars with cotton seed oil, and sends them rolling north again. And back and forth over its humming rails fly the passenger trains, bearing men intent on business, whose travel has for object the negotiation and adjustment of exchanges between ten thousand different producing points. How easy it is, in all this, to trace the beneficent effect of the protective system, whose avowed purpose—whose avowed purpose—that is, whose avowed purpose—oh! what's the use of talking?—there's the railroad, isn't it? and there's the tariff, isn't it? Well, then, what more do you want?

And yet, telling as is Mr. Whitman's citation of the Pennsylvania railroad company's report, we cannot help thinking that there are facts and statistics which might be quoted to more advantage. An audience has to think before it appreciates the full force of the Pennsylvania illustration, and even then the application is somewhat elusive; whereas downright statements about the condition of workingmen and the rate of wages strike with a ledge hammer force of logic that obviates the necessity of any but the most unconscious cerebration on the part of the listener. Here, for example, is a specimen of the sort of thing we would advise Mr. Whitman to offer to his hearers next time he makes a speech on behalf of protection:

The advocates of the great principle of protection to American industry need resort to no laborious arguments to demonstrate the truth they preach. As clearly as the child can see that two things and two things make four things, so clearly can the most ordinary intelligence appreciate the wonderful prosperity of our country, and trace the connection between that prosperity and the wise laws that prevent less happy nations from eluding us with their products.

Consider the condition of the United States. While other lands are cursed with arid wastes of birth and wealth, here labor is the only patent of nobility. The man who works the hardest makes the most, and the one who seeks to live by others' toil is rushed beneath the weight of public scorn. Other nations have their industrial wars and armies, their strikes and lockouts, their boycotts and black lists, their trades unions and their trusts. Here labor is ever at a premium; their wages are rising steadily, and employer bids to against employer to secure the workman's service. Alms houses, tenement houses, dime lodging houses, soup charities—all these are towns only by tradition. The poorest man who occupies a house of his own and maintains a family in ease and comfort, England and many have their tramps, wandering from sea to place, at first in search of work, but ally as mere pariahs of civilization, but so ever heard of a tramp in the United States? Why, it is actually difficult to make school children understand that there was a time when men begged for the village of work, and women and their little were forced to toil for bread. Such is glorious condition in which we find ourselves after only a quarter of a century of freedom. And shall we risk the loss of so advantages? Forbid it, heaven!

And so on, and so on. The rest of the speech can be adapted to the audience, the ringing in allusions to local industries and advantages as may be necessary. A speech couldn't fail to be effective, would not only gratefully tickle the ears of those who are already protectionists, it might even have a very considerable effect in converting free trade enemies from the error of their ways. In it, it's the sort of speech that ought to be made. As for the fact that it's a mere neg of nonsensical untruths—why, if Whitman is going to make that objection, we greatly fear that he will have given up the making of protectionist eches altogether.

FALSE LABELS ON TWADDLE.

Mrs. John Sherwood discusses in a wide-published article the important question "How to properly conduct a fashionable party nowadays." This is a subject which many who ardently wish to give a fashionable dinner parties probably greeted competent instructions; but if their attention demands minute direction in details we fear that they will find little but appointment in Mrs. Sherwood's article. She insists that the art of entertaining is a that may be cultivated, but can not be wired. What hope is there in this for women who most keenly long to give social distinction in this line, but lacks the inspiration that Mrs. Sherwood insists must accompany the aspiration? From a somewhat cursory examination of this lady's treatment of what she perily calls "a social problem," we are to fear that she writes for the sake of being, rather than from the consciousness of possession of an important truth to which she must give form and expression. This surmise is well founded. Mrs. Sherwood does not differ greatly from other writers who attempt to discuss a more ambitious fashion the far greater problem—how are people to get dinner of any kind? Bishop J. L. Spalding, instance, in the current number of the Social Life Threatened? The good op rambles over the whole field, gently stating that prohibition will not accomplish all that its advocates hope for, mild-protecting that the wrath of capital

against the organization of labor is not well founded, and indicating a bias for free trade, though he suggests that the existence of manufacturing centers is inimical to the success of popular government, which is by no means a logical deduction from a thorough understanding of the effects of free trade.

He glances hastily at the doctrine that the land is the natural heritage of the people, but declares that "the evils which Henry George and others ascribe to our system of land tenure are in fact the results of modern industrialism, and hitherto human wisdom and ingenuity have failed to discover a remedy for what seems to be a vice of constitution." Capital, steam and electricity, organized and controlled by men whose one object is gain, act, he says, "upon a population of operatives like a malarial poison." To this he attributes the fact that "in a country whose immeasurable resources we have hardly begun to explore, pauperism has become a chronic disease," while in our great cities and manufacturing centers there has arisen an ominous irrepressible conflict between the rich and the poor. No attempt is made to really consider the only solution now proposed for this dismal dilemma, and the bishop concludes his article with the declaration that "meanwhile, whatever fault we may find with our political or social life, there is no other actually existing and discernible which a wise man ought to choose in preference." Now it may not be necessary that a bishop should really think about mere mundane affairs, but unless he does propose to think about them why should he write about them?

Professor Julius H. Seelye has an article in the same magazine on "Our Political Prospects" which is largely an essay on the characteristics of the American people by a studious man who has evolved his opinions on the subject from his own inner consciousness instead of forming them from observation. For instance, he credits us with a sedulous concern for the maintenance of the rights of minorities, and thinks that civil service reform is likely to become the settled policy of our government, because to give political office as a reward for party service "is the affirmation of a class domination utterly intolerable." Now the cold, uncomfortable truth is that the American people are not much concerned about the rights of minorities, while such advance as has been made in the way of civil service reform has not been due to any such exalted public opinion as the professor describes, but to the fact that an active and persistent minority were determined to have it, and that parties were so evenly balanced in power that they had to bid for the vote of that minority in order to win. The majority of the men who really manage and control political parties into the competitive system, and the great body of their followers sympathize with them. There has never been a democratic or republican convention that would not declare that to the victors belongs the spoils if it dared do so. It is not high principle, but hard-headed consideration of political expediency that causes the majority of each party to defer in this matter to a minority in its own ranks.

Professor Seelye does manage in his article to refer to the tariff question, but merely for the purpose of saying that the wide sympathy for all mankind which he discovers in the American people, and which causes our thoughts and feelings to go out to all the world, "forbids any permanent attempt on our part to secure our independence by isolation." All this is printed, not in some book designed to be a permanent addition to the literature of all ages, but in a New York magazine for the month of March, 1888, when a tariff reduction bill is pending in congress, when preparations are already making for two opposing presidential conventions, and the great fight for or against making permanent the policy of isolation has already begun.

Are these platitudes of bishops and inconsequential speculations of college professors all that our most pretentious periodicals have to contribute to the great debate now about to begin, and which will inevitably go beyond tariff reform and free trade to the vast question of why it is that the application of capital, labor and natural forces to the immeasurable resources of our country produces hatred and pauperism instead of peace and plenty? If so, the editors of these publications had better confine their writers to the class of social topics discussed by Mrs. Sherwood, and not create false hopes among virile readers, who hunger for meat fit for men, by printing the veriest twaddle over high sounding names and under such titles as "Our Political Prospects" and "Is Our Social Life Threatened?"

THE WHISKY TRUST.

The various investigations do not appear to have checked the tendency to combine. Last summer the whisky manufacturers, whose headquarters are at Peoria, Ill., began the formation of a trust. One of its principal organizers when asked by a reporter if it would create a monopoly in whisky exultingly answered, "Yes; and of such proportions that it will compare with the Standard oil company and the American cotton oil trust in point of far reaching power." When this gentleman goes before the congressional committee he will doubtless declare that nothing is further from the intentions of the combination than the formation of a monopoly, and that the trust is a benevolent institution designed primarily to provide for the widows and orphans of distillers and to cultivate a taste among drinking men for "blended" whisky, the distillers of

"straight" whisky for some reason not being in the combination.

The trust promptly assumed large proportions, and perhaps prohibitionists will be gratified to learn that on the 18th of last month it was announced that of seventy distilleries belonging to the combination fifty-seven had been closed, though their owners were making large profits out of the remaining thirteen, the product of which had been enormously increased. At the end of January but two large distillers north of Kentucky still remained out of the combination, and these were Schufeldt of Chicago and Daddsworth of Cincinnati, and a desperate effort was making to force the latter to succumb. He had similarly stood out against the preceding combination, the whisky pool, by appealing to his customers to stand by him and not let him be forced inside the monopoly. He is pursuing a similar course now, and the members of the trust say he must be compelled to come in or be broken down. A recent Cincinnati dispatch to the Chicago Tribune said:

A member of the trust said to-day that a policy had been determined upon with reference to Daddsworth which he felt sure would dispose of him. The plan is to seek out Daddsworth's trade and represent that all customers of his who uphold him in his fight against the trust will be refused goods by the trust after Daddsworth has been compelled to close his distillery. If they remain with him and he succumbs, as in the opinion of members of the trust he must do, they will go down with him. This will be a very potent argument with his customers, and it is thought he may recognize it as such and surrender before such a fight is made on him.

Here is a conspiracy to boycott that exceeds in proportions any yet tried in the courts, and the Kentucky distillers who have an "association" instead of a trust are asking merchants to refuse to purchase of those among them who have broken the association's agreement to stop production in order to increase the price.

This is a monopoly that owes its existence to the internal revenue laws, which, like the tariff and, in fact, all indirect taxes, promote monopoly. Many good people want these laws maintained, under the supposition that they curtail the consumption of whisky. This is at least doubtful, while it is certain that the monopoly facilitates the production of "blended" or "doctored" whisky. Putting these incidental effects aside, however, it is clear that similar laws affecting any product of universally acknowledged utility would facilitate a monopoly in its manufacture. It would be impossible for a combination to control the price of any thing so easily produced as whisky were it not for the internal revenue laws.

There are at present good and sufficient reasons why a tax that increases the price of whisky and at the same time yields a large income to the government should be permitted to remain while there are taxes that enhance the price of clothing and other necessities of life that can be reduced or abolished; but the lesson taught by the internal taxes ought not to be forgotten. That lesson is that every tax on the products of industry checks industrial enterprise, promotes the growth of monopoly and costs the people vastly more than it yields to the government. There is but one reasonable and equitable tax, and that is the single tax on land values. That prevents monopoly and encourages individual enterprise without resort to arbitrary measures to defeat attempts at combination.

CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC.

The return of Speaker Carlisle to Washington is said to have resulted in a general effort to hurry up legislation. The house committees certainly needed some spur to action. Not a single appropriation bill has been passed, though the fourth month of the session is rapidly drawing to a close. Congress has fallen into a bad habit in this respect, and unless public opinion is aroused to a demand for greater promptitude in the dispatch of necessary business there is little hope of amendment. The worst effect of such delay is not the great public expense involved in the needless prolongation of a session, but the opportunity offered for useless and worse than useless legislation.

If the house of representatives were to adopt rules requiring the committees concerned to bring in appropriation bills early in each session, and would then dispose of them before transacting any other business, the public could give intelligent attention to the proposed legislation causing further prolongation of the sessions of congress and protest against it. At present many bills are passed while the body is nominally "doing nothing," and when therefore but little if any intelligent attention is given by the public to affairs at Washington. In fact it is only measures of great importance, like the proposed tariff bill, that really do arouse public interest, and neither the newspapers nor the people attempt to follow legislation closely.

The change that has come about in journalism of late years is largely responsible for this. Most of us can remember when every prominent newspaper printed daily a complete, though condensed, account of all the proceedings of congress, and in order to facilitate the performance of this duty the press associations were given special privileges on the floor in both houses. To-day few, if any, daily newspapers make any pretense of using these reports. They are still received, and any portions of them that appear interesting to a news editor are culled out and printed, preference being given to a debate in which members have lost their temper and indulged in personalities. In this, as in all other matters, the sensational is preferred to the important, and the report of the proceedings of con-

gress is ruthlessly cut down to make room for full details of a "spicy" divorce suit, the story of a crime or a prize fight or the report of a royal wedding or funeral. There is no first-class daily paper now published which recognizes as a duty it owes to its readers the furnishing of a complete record of all that congress does from day to day.

So long as this condition of affairs continues public opinion cannot be brought to bear effectively on congressional legislation. Not merely will needless delays prolong the sessions, but the few active men interested in special legislation will continue to exercise greater influence at Washington than the whole body of the people. Fortunately in the tariff bill we have a measure that does excite general interest, and it may be possible that the attention given to it will awaken a wider interest in legislation in general. If such should be the case those newspapers that pretend to appeal to thoughtful people will be compelled to give at least as much attention to national legislation as they now give to a scurrying match or a dog fight, and to turn over the editing of their congressional reports to men who will not regard everything that is serious as therefore dull.

NEWPORT'S MISTAKE.

A correspondent of the *World*, writing from Newport, R. I., informs New Yorkers who have cottages at Newport that the tax assessors of that watering place have opened up the usual spring campaign and are entering upon the tax list the record of improvements made during the past year. The assessors told the correspondent that more money had been expended upon Newport property by New Yorkers since last summer than during any similar period in the history of the town. With the assessors' books as his source of information, the correspondent proceeds to enumerate the many New Yorkers who will find their assessments for the present year increased in consequence of their having added to the wealth and beauty of Newport and given employment to Newport's people. Apparently there has been no increase in the assessments made upon those whose houses or grounds have not been improved, and perhaps the owners of such property might by the assessors be deemed justified in petitioning for a decrease in their taxes, since their houses are older. The owners of property having no improvements whatever upon it also seem to have been saved from the raids of the assessors.

Of course the meaning of all this is that the people of Newport are tired of having their city used as a fashionable summer resort by rich New Yorkers. They want to restore the old time simplicity of Providence Plantations, and keep the goddess *jeunesse doree* of New York at a safe and uncorrupting distance. And so they punish everybody who presumes to erect a villa, or lay out a pleasant lawn, by imposing a fine on him, proportioned to the amount of his offense.

They mean well, these Newport people, but their eastern simplicity has a good deal to learn about the persistence of New York people in wickedness. The aboriginal Newporter, when threatened with a fine if he dares to build a carriage house, or a new wing to his mansion, will generally restrain his evil impulses, content himself with the old fashioned shed for his carriage, and crowd his family into a limited number of rooms. But the fashionable New Yorker is different. When he has set his heart on the commission of a crime, such as the erection of a cottage, or the laying out of a park, or the making of a road, it is hard to turn him. Certainly the infliction of a fine will rarely do it. He may use strong language or try to escape the penalty by lying, but he'll go on sinning and improving just the same. He is one of those hardened sinners against whom sterner measures must be adopted.

If instead of a tax fine the people of Rhode Island will substitute imprisonment at hard labor as a punishment for improving and beautifying their cities, they will produce an effect upon the summer visitors to Newport which will at once astonish and delight them. Punishment, to be effectual, must be adapted not only to the crime but to the criminal as well.

CLAMORING FOR HIGH FREIGHT RATES.

The *Sun* is engaged in a unique warfare. It is endeavoring to excite popular feeling against the Canadian Pacific railroad for carrying freight between the Pacific coast states and the Atlantic coast states at a lower rate than our own Pacific roads will consent to. It charges that the Canadian Pacific road is built through a howling wilderness, where there is not population, agriculture or trade enough to justify the construction of such a highway of commerce; where, in fact, there is not business sufficient to pay the cost of the most parsimonious train service, and that hence it has been arranged by the foreign owners of the road that Americans must support it. This coercive policy has been carried out by the fixing of piratically cheap rates, and the "corporate devil fish" in 1887 perpetrated "a successful robbery of twelve million dollars" of freight traffic from the American Pacific railroads. The *Sun* foresees bankruptcy for these roads and weeps thereat copiously.

But the American people do not appear to be giving way to grief and rage at the disappointment of their own Pacific roads over the result of their refusal to carry freight as cheaply as a competitor. When the Canadian Pacific railroad receives at its western terminus very large amounts of merchandise shipped coastwise from San Francisco and other Ameri-

can Pacific ports, transports it east over its great length of line and distributes it by various American connecting lines to commercial centers in the United States, the American consumers are not injured. Their goods have been moved a distance perhaps a third more than they would have been if shipped over one of their own Pacific roads, by a railroad having a non-remunerative local traffic along its length, yet which is expected to pay dividends on a capitalization of \$65,000,000. If the American transcontinental roads refuse to compete with such a rival, the American citizen has no occasion to mourn, and his sense of proprietorship in our own American railroads is not lively enough to prompt him to pay more for so short an American haul than for so long a Canadian haul. And by the way, the *Sun* is in a funny muddle over the long and short haul clause of the interstate commerce law. It speaks of the provisions of the act forbidding the railroads "to charge less proportionally for a short than a long haul." The act in reality prescribes that no more shall be charged for a shorter than a longer haul, under substantially the same conditions. Besides reversing the hauls, the *Sun* has erred to the matter of proportion. It is not touched upon in the clause. But this is a slight matter as compared with the blunder of supposing that the American people are bent on paying heavy dividends to their own Pacific railroads.

ALARMED PINE MEN.

The Whatcom, W. T., *Reveille*, speaking of the lumber interests of Washington territory, says this:

The pine men are alarmed over the proposed action of congress to remove the duty on lumber, and can scarcely talk of anything else. They represent that the crown lands of British Columbia are leased for a mere song, and if lumber is admitted free from that country, interests in Oregon, Washington territory and California, reaching many millions of dollars, would be seriously crippled, if not destroyed. They have united in a general call to congress, and are organizing to resist the reduction.

Dear! dear! How dreadful! And yet it seems, in a manner, a little strange, too. Because if it really be the hard fisted laborer that our protective tariff protects, a "pine man" must mean a man who makes a living by cutting or manufacturing pine lumber, and it isn't altogether clear why even a "pine man" should feel called upon to wait over the prospect of getting the raw material of his business cheaper. One would suppose that if the duty on lumber were removed, the "pine men" of Washington territory would fold up their tents like the Arabs, and silently steal away to British Columbia, where crown lands "are leased for a mere song." Getting the privilege of cutting on those tuneful terms, they could furnish their product to the American consumer more cheaply, and at the same time make better wages for themselves.

But it is evident that it is not of "pine men" of this sort that the *Reveille* is talking. When it speaks of "pine men" it does not mean the hard-fisted laborers who cut down the trees, or those who saw the logs into lumber, or those who convert that lumber into its ten thousand uses. By "pine men" it really means land men. The people whose interests, "reaching many millions of dollars," are so inhumanly menaced, are really the millionaire monopolists who, by virtue of our land and tariff laws, are now enabled to thrust their hands into the pockets not only of the real "pine men," but of the rest of our people who make any use of pine wood, and take out two dollars or thereabouts for every thousand feet of lumber cut. Their interests are menaced, sure enough, and the more they are menaced the better for the people of the United States. The dog probably felt that he was in danger of being "seriously crippled, if not destroyed," when the cow asked him to get out of the manger, but there is reason to believe that he got out just the same.

OPPOSING THE TELEGRAPH BILL.

There is no pretense to regard for public opinion among those who display a determined hostility to the passage of a postal telegraph bill. There has been no opposition worth considering to such a measure shown outside of congress. Here and there a newspaper has served the existing monopoly by expressing a fear that governmental control of the telegraph would unduly increase the patronage of the appointing power; but aside from this there has been absolutely no expression of public opinion adverse to the measure. Considering the magnitude of the interests involved, this is rather remarkable and suggests a suspicion that Jay Gould and his associates prefer to work in secret.

In favor of the bill, however, there has been a strong manifestation of public sentiment. The Knights of Labor and the telegraphers have petitioned for the establishment of a governmental telegraph, and numerous petitions for it have been sent in by less important bodies. The general expression of newspaper opinion is in favor of the bill, and individual merchants and other business men when interviewed have declared a similar opinion. Occasional have been rare when any measure pending before congress has been backed by so many indications of public favor or public opposition by so few people.

Why then this tender solicitude among congressmen who have never failed themselves to grab at every possibility of patronage lest the patronage of the executive shall be unduly extended? Telegraphy being an art requiring skill and training, there is less danger of improper influences governing the appointment of telegraphers than of almost any other class of public servants. Again, if this be the real objection, it is easily obviated by

the addition of a specially stringent competitive examination clause to the bill.

The unpleasant thing about this opposition to a postal telegraph is that it has no known public support and is in the interest of a vast and grasping monopoly that is fiercely fighting the bill in private while doing nothing openly. Has the Western Union telegraph company more influence than the people with congress?

THEY BEGIN TO SEE.

The effect of land speculation on the welfare of a community begins to be appreciated. Hitherto the newspapers of growing towns and cities have hailed with extravagant enthusiasm every rise in land values as an indication of increasing prosperity, and the successful land speculator has been regarded as one of the most valuable members of a community. The agitation of the land question has thrown light into dark places, and newspapers that are bitterly, though ignorantly, hostile to the single tax are at least learning that land speculation does not benefit anybody but the speculators.

The Toledo, Ohio, *Commercial* recently congratulated its readers on the fact that "Toledo appears to have ample security against real estate speculation." It says the people of that city are opposed to a "boom," and even the real estate dealers are against selling property on a supposed future valuation. Furthermore, no material limitations prevent the growth of the city in any direction. All of these circumstances the *Commercial* regards as safeguards "against the calamity of inflation," and they appear to it "to afford ample security against the manipulation of prices based upon speculative values."

Unless the system of taxation in Toledo differs widely from that in vogue elsewhere, we fear that the *Commercial*'s sense of security is ill founded; but it is, nevertheless, a matter to be noted with satisfaction that an influential paper in a growing city should see so clearly that land speculation is a curse instead of a blessing to a community.

If public sentiment in Toledo is fairly reflected by the *Commercial* the people there must be nearly ripe for the consideration of the one system that can entirely prevent land speculation and at the same time permit a rise in land values to become a great public benefit.

THE TELEPHONE DECISION.

The supreme court of the United States has by a vote of four to three, two members not participating, upheld the Bell telephone patent, and thereby confirmed the existing monopoly. The members concurring in the decision are Chief Justice Waite and Justices Miller, Matthews and Blatchford. Justices Bradley, Field and Harlan join in the dissenting opinion, and Justice Lamar, appointed since the argument took place, and Justice Gray did not sit. Two reasons are assigned for the failure of the latter to take part in the proceedings. One is the fact made public long ago that numerous members of his family are large holders of Bell stock, and the other is that he had previously sat on trials of the cases appealed. If the latter is a sufficient reason for his failure to sit, it is difficult to find justification for Justice Blatchford sitting, since he had also in a lower court delivered an opinion sustaining the claims of the Bell company.

There does not appear to be any difference of opinion on any of the points in dispute except as to the claim of Drawbaugh to priority of invention. The dissenting opinion says that conclusive evidence was given by numerous witnesses that Drawbaugh had perfected an electric telephone that transmitted spoken words as early as 1871, five years before the patent was issued to Mr. Bell, but suggests that Drawbaugh failed to appreciate the importance of his invention. The dissenting opinion also broadly intimates that the prominence of Mr. Bell in scientific and social circles has all along given him a great advantage in this dispute with a comparatively unknown mechanic like Mr. Drawbaugh. "We have nothing to say deprecatory of Mr. Bell," it continues, "for he has real merits; but we think that this obscure mechanic did do the thing, and that he is entitled to the merit of being the first inventor."

The majority sets aside Drawbaugh's claims on the ground that his conduct after hearing that some one else had invented a telephone in 1876 was "entirely inconsistent with the idea even then of a complete discovery or invention by himself which could be put to any practical use." Here we find the majority of the court resting a tremendous decision on a mere inference, in defiance of the fact proven, the dissenting justices say, by a cloud of uncontradicted witnesses, that Drawbaugh had actually invented a telephone that transmitted speech several years before a patent was issued to Bell. What does it matter whether or not Drawbaugh appreciated the importance of his invention? The only question was, did he not invent a telephone? and even according to the opinion delivered by the majority, this vital question of fact has been decided against the weight of evidence.

The decision is one that will have the effect of prolonging an odious monopoly which has already exacted millions from the public, and it is doubly exasperating because of the close division of opinion among the judges and the apparent bias of the majority that led them to prefer their own inference to positive testimony which they do not pretend has been impeached. The outcome is not one that is likely to increase public respect for and confidence in our court of last resort. It is beyond remedy, however, at present, but indicates the urgent necessity of some

revision of our patent laws that will provide for the protection of inventors without establishing dangerous monopolies.

THE POOR IRISH LANDLORD.

The starving Irish tenant has had his day, and the impoverished Irish landlord is now the special object of sympathy in English Tory circles. A deputation representing these gentry waited on Lord Salisbury at the foreign office a few weeks ago and poured their tale of woe into the sympathetic ears of his lordship and Mr. Balfour. They said they regretted the necessity, but "the time had come when the impoverished Irish landlords were compelled to lay their case before the government and the country." They objected to the methods of fixing fair rents, demanded compensation for the losses inflicted upon them by recent legislation, and declared that upon the response to their appeal "would in all probability depend the very existence of the class that the deputation represented."

Lord Salisbury's reply was full of sympathy for what he called "the extreme and very undeserved sufferings which the mass of Irish landlords had undergone," but he was shy of committing himself to compensation, their claim to which he very properly declared to be by no means such an ordinary case of compensation as is provided for by existing law. He advised them to depend on parliament to mitigate or improve the laws complained of. He further informed them that their losses were not entirely due to legislation, but were partly owing to the great economic changes, from which another, impoverished and oppressed class, the English landlords, were also suffering. Whether the Irish landlords obtained any satisfaction from the interview is not stated.

The London *Star* denounces the document they presented to Lord Salisbury as "about as sublime a specimen of the begging letter imposture as ever entered into the brain of mendicant impudence," and compares their claim for compensation to a similar demand by Bill Sikes because of damage done to his business by burglar proof safes and locks. The *Star* contrasts Lord Salisbury's sympathetic answer to his fellow land grabbers with the sneers and gibes in which he indulged when an application was made to him by Cardinal Manning and his friends in behalf of the London poor.

Though the incident justly excites the anger of the *Star* and the criticism of the *Christian Commonwealth*, it is, nevertheless, full of cheer. Lord Salisbury clearly told the sturdy beggars that they could only look to parliament for future relief, and hinted that compensation for the past is out of the question, and this, too, after the deputation had told him that the very existence of the landlord class in Ireland depended on a more favorable reply. If this be true, then such existence is only a question of time and cannot be greatly prolonged. If their salvation depends upon the willingness of the British parliament to tax Englishmen to pay Irish landlords for loss of rents, the latter had better prepare for the worst and look about for some honest occupation at which they can earn a living. Even English Tories would not dare make such a proposal, and when their term of reactionary rule ends, any suggestion of the kind would be laughed out of the house by a liberal parliament.

We hope the deputation spoke truly, and that the existence of the class it represented is drawing to a close as rapidly as is indicated by the address.

A HINT TO STANFORD.

Senator Stanford is now posing as one of the martyrs to the rapacity shown by the United States government in its dealings with the Pacific railroad. He does not deny that the government issued its bonds to the Central Pacific road, but he complains that the company had to sell them at a discount, and thinks that the least the government can now do is to repay the company's losses caused through the low credit of the United States. He also insists that as the companies completed the roads seven years before the time named in the contract the government ought to pay over to them the gross amount of the difference of cost between wagon and railway transportation during those seven years.

Mr. Huntington also insists that the government is bound to reward the perfervid patriotism that led the Central Pacific company to rush operations so that its road met the Union Pacific at Ogden instead of waiting for the Union Pacific to meet it at Reno. This costly patriotism was rewarded only by so many acres of land and so many depreciated bonds per mile, and, it appears from Senator Stanford's complaint, has never received any other recognition.

A rich and generous nation cannot afford to add a new instance to the ingratitude of republics; and we suggest that the patriots, Stanford, Huntington and Crocker, as a fitting reward for their patriotic fervor in the darkest hours of our country's history, be each given the rank of lieutenant general and placed on the retired list of the army and that a proper pension be voted to the widow of Hopkins. Under such circumstances the survivors may consent to compromise their vast claim against the country on the liberal basis of the payment of the Central Pacific bonds by the government and the cancellation of the mortgage it holds against that company.

Mr. Huntington might gain some credit for modesty by submitting such a proposal to his fellow millionaires in the United States senate as a substitute for the greater

demands made in his behalf by his attorney.

The Washington correspondent of the New York *Times* recently asked M. D. Shaw, a member of the Ohio legislature, about the "wool growers' association," whose hostility to the president's message has been so loudly heralded by the protectionist papers. Mr. Shaw replied:

Well, as shown by a recent meeting of that organization held by permission in the hall used by our state house of representatives, it consisted of thirteen members, ten of whom are republicans. One of these republicans is a former controller of the treasury (Lawrence), who is a lawyer by profession. Another, Columbus Delano, is several times a millionaire, and was secretary of the interior under Grant's administration. I looked carefully over the members present at this meeting, and found that nearly every one of them had been an office holder under republican administrations.

Mr. Shaw insists that, despite the attitude of the congressmen of the state, the great mass of Ohio democrats approve the president's message, and that a very considerable number of republicans favor tariff reduction.

The ways and means committee is beginning to make some appreciable progress in preparing to report its tariff bill. It is steadily going over the measure paragraph by paragraph and putting it into its final shape. A number of changes have been made, generally in the direction of still further lowering duties. The republican members of the committee complain bitterly of their treatment by the majority. The minority, of course, attack each clause proposed, and some of them make speeches denouncing it. The majority listen in silence and then fix the clause to suit themselves and pass on to the next. Such tactics would not, under ordinary circumstances, be justifiable, but as the majority of the committee is really determined to introduce a bill that will reduce the tariff, and the minority desires to prevent any reduction, the latter are not entitled to much consideration. They will oppose the measure as a whole in any event, and their proper course, if they were honest in desiring a less drastic measure, would be to prepare a bill of their own and support it as a substitute for the majority bill. Under the circumstances the attitude of the majority merely affords gratifying evidence of a determination to prevent the success of the dilatory tactics of the republicans. The bill ought to be completed and reported as soon as possible.

Senator Brown of Georgia says that the south ought to support "the tariff policy that has enriched the north." The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* pertinently replies:

Mr. Brown should have explained what he means by "the north." Does he mean the mass of the people or a small millionaire class? Now, why does not the north adopt the penitentiary lease system which has proved so effective in enriching Senator Brown?

There need be no doubt as to which north the Georgia senator has in his eye. He is thus far probably the only southern senator who owes his place directly to the possession of millions and his sympathies and associations are with the small class that has benefited by "protection." If he were to look at the question from the standpoint of the masses he would find that the "poor" unprotected south is much more free from pauperism than the "rich" protected north.

Carpenters and builders will find interesting reading in an article from the New York *Times* printed in another column, telling anew the story of the way in which the protected manufacturers of wood screws in this country hired a member of the British parliament to keep his hands off while they picked the pockets of all who build or own houses in the United States.

Three assessors at Livingston, Livingston county, N. Y., have been indicted by the grand jury for perjury in swearing to an erroneous assessment roll. Assessors throughout Livingston and adjacent counties are filled with alarm and all are busily engaged in revising their own work.

Down here in the city Mayor Hewitt condones such offenses, and all assessors, habitually and without concealment, grossly undervalue land that they are sworn to assess at its true value. The indictment of one or more of the number might have an excellent effect, even if the prospects of punishment were no greater than they appear to be in Livingston county, where the indicted men are looked upon as martyrs, one of them having been nominated by the republicans for re-election.

Dispatches from Canton, Ohio, announce the arrest in that city of a certain Jerome Markle, who, at the time of his capture, was peacefully attending his aunt's funeral. The telegraphic dispatch announcing the arrest makes no mention of the charge against Markle, but says that he is forty years old and "has amassed a small fortune without ever having been known to do any work." If that alone be deemed a sufficient cause for arrest, good society in New York will begin to tremble for many of its favorites. The most earnest land reformer has never demanded such harsh treatment of those who made fortunes without doing any work.

The combined Chicago gas companies have informed the city council that they will not furnish gas to private consumers throughout that city for \$1 a thousand feet. The Chicago *Herald* declares that "it is now the duty of the city and the state to bring all the resources of the people to bear against the illegal combination of speculators who have sought to fasten

a huge fictitious charge on the householders of that city." Very well. Let the city of Chicago furnish its people with gas at \$1, or less, per thousand and charge these private parties, who are now occupying its public streets with their pipes, a sufficient rent to cause them to move. The "resources of the people" certainly ought to be equal to a little thing like that.

Our money kings are taking on royal style, and our press and people seem disposed to accord them royal honors. Jay Gould recently arrived at St. Augustine, Fla., in his yacht, and his son George went south to meet him. The princely progress of George was interrupted by a railway accident, and the papers have ever since been full of his sayings and doings, while it has required columns of their space to announce the arrival of King Jay, which was evidently regarded as a great event by the wealthy loungers from the north who have adopted the fashion of wintering in Florida. All that was needed to complete the reception was a royal salute from the guns in the harbor. After present tendencies have gone a little further the Pinkerton private army will doubtless be on hand on such occasions to attend to the matter of salutes.

The hereditary legislators of Great Britain were horrified on Monday by the audacity of the earl of Roseberry, who moved the appointment of a committee to inquire into the constitution of the house of lords with a view to amending it. Lord Roseberry declared that the time has come when a large infusion of elected peers is necessary if the influence of the house is to be restored. The audacious proposal was rejected by a vote of 97 to 50, as was to be expected. Nevertheless it is a sign of the times worth noting that such a proposal should not merely have been made, but that it received the votes of fifty peers in its favor.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Former Members of the Executive Committee Withdraw From the Society.

The following card is the result of the action taken at the last meeting of the withdrawing members of the executive committee of the anti-poverty society:

New York, March 21, 1888.
In order that there may no longer be any dispute as to the status of those now claiming to be the executive committee of the anti-poverty society, and that there shall be no unseemly struggle for the control of the organization at the ensuing annual meeting, the undersigned, hitherto members of the executive committee have resigned from such committee and withdrawn from the society:

J. O. S. HUNTINGTON, HUGH O. PENTECOST,
EVERETT GLACKIN, EDWARD J. SHIVER,
WALTER CARR, A. J. STEERS,
TOM L. JOHNSON, JEROME McNEIL,
BENJ. UAXER, HENRY GEORGE,
LOUIS F. POST, T. L. McCREARY,
W. T. CROSBADLE, WILLIAM McCABE,
J. W. SULLIVAN.

In addition to those named above, the following gentlemen, who were members of the executive committee on Feb. 13, have resigned:

Charles F. Wingate, James P. Archibald,
Rev. J. Anketell, John W. Waters,
Edward Johnson.

Of the remaining members, James Redpath, J. C. Fleming and J. V. George, have not for months attended meetings or taken part in the recent controversy, thus leaving of the thirty-one persons who were recognized as members of the committee on Feb. 13 but nine who are still acting as members. These are:

Dr. Edw. McGlynn, Gaybert Barnes,
Dr. J. Coughlin, Wm. B. Clarke,
John MacMackin, Michael Clarke,
James O'Flaherty, Hugh Whorisky,
Dr. Wm. S. Gotcheil.

As Mr. E. J. Shriver, late treasurer of the anti-poverty society, deems that an injustice would be done by letting the speech of Dr. McGlynn, reported in THE STANDARD of last week, pass uncontradicted, we give place to the following communication, trusting that this will be the last of an unpleasant and unprofitable subject. The many correspondents who have written to THE STANDARD in commendation of the course of the majority of the committee and in criticism of the acts which compelled their withdrawal, and whose communications have not been published, will understand the reasons which make an exception in this case proper:

New York City.—In his address at the Academy of Music on March 11, as published by you, Dr. McGlynn made a statement of the occurrences at the anti-poverty committee meeting, during which I moved his suspension, in which he presented me in the light of an instrument selected by a conspiracy to humiliate him. While I do not wish to embarrass you in carrying out the policy of dignified silence which you seem to have assumed, I trust you will allow me the opportunity to contradict certain of Dr. McGlynn's assertions, as a matter due to myself.

The course of action agreed upon by the majority of the committee for that evening did not include Dr. McGlynn's suspension. He may have dreaded such action as a just rebuke to him for arrogating the power to dictate a policy for the united labor party at an anti-poverty society meeting, but the motion when made was made on my individual responsibility, without consultation with any one, because it seemed to me personally the best way to stop further illegitimate exercise by him of the appointing power. It is morally impossible that Dr. McGlynn should not have known this when he delivered the address to which I allude, as a full description of our programme had been given to several of his intimate friends.

Dr. McGlynn further stated that "seven or eight" of the withdrawing committee men were employees of THE STANDARD, and in various ways that all of us were acting, not of our own motion, but in obedience to STANDARD policy. Both the statement and the inference are untrue.

EDWARD J. SHIVER.

Let the Trouble Come.

Cedar Rapids News Era.
The Marion *Free Press* declares that "the trouble with the single land tax is that no speculator would pay the rental value of land which they could not use for anything else. It is what the *Free Press* calls 'the trouble' with the single tax, we verily believe that the working people of this country would like to be troubled in just that way. We give you the single tax and 'the trouble' along with it."

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.
Published weekly at
33 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.
TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.
Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.
Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.
THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscriptions at every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.
THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.
Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1888.
THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Australian Gold.
NORWICH, N. Y.—The strong point you make against protection is that shutting out imports cuts off exports, thus destroying the commerce of the nation to a certain extent. This seems evident, as a nation cannot take our products unless we want and are willing to take products of that nation in payment. Now, I wish to raise this point for you to comment upon: Suppose that our tariff constitutes such an embargo that Australia, which wants our manufactured articles, can pay us only in gold (not being prohibited), and that we continue to draw on Australia for gold for a period of years, receiving nothing else in return for our products. I am aware that gold is a commodity—not money—when used in the exchange of nations, and we receive it from Australia as bullion. Possibly such bullion would be of little value to us, even when coined over and made into our money. Could we put that gold to use, and in what way? Of course we could put it to some use, but what would it be and what would be the extent of the loss on such trade?
ELMORE SHARPE.

In the case you put, if Australia made large demands for our products and her gold held out, it would involve less work for us to make the things that Australia wanted and let Australia dig gold for us than to dig our own gold. The tendency would be to reduce the value of gold and to make our gold mines less valuable than they are. On such trade we would lose nothing—we would gain. The only losers would be our gold mine owners.

We would put the gold to such uses as we do now—dentistry, jewelry, and so forth; and we would use it to a greater extent than before, for more of our people could afford to use it, first, because they would get better pay for their work, and second, because gold would be cheaper. We would also ship Australian gold to other countries in exchange for their goods.

The Inducement to Keep Land Out of Use.
PHILADELPHIA.—In the unpublished portion of the letter to which you reply in your issue of February 18, I asked "why you contend that those holding unused agricultural land will not rent it to the highest bidder?" I am therefore justified in assuming that in the example of mines which you have given you consider that the same conditions obtain as in the case of agricultural land, each class of opportunities being owned by thousands of persons, each competing with the others to secure the largest return from his possessions. I have asked you to show me the inducement which the competitive owners of opportunities located within the margin of cultivation have for keeping them out of use?

I can see such an inducement in the case of city lots, which may become available for business purposes, and which cannot be used temporarily without erecting a comparatively costly structure in the form of a residence, which would have to be destroyed later in order to put the lot to the best possible use. Your remark on that subject in the issue of March 3 is therefore hardly pertinent to my question.

You say that only fifty would be mined in the first and fifty in the second year. What is it not to the interest of each owner to mine 100 and since the demand is for only 100, would not competition between them cause the rent of the second mine to fall to zero, and that of the first to a trifle below two-tenths?

(1) I now repeat my original question: Assuming that the land owners are not all members of one syndicate, what inducement has any one holding land on speculation to keep his land out of use, if its temporary use does not involve an expenditure equal to or exceeding the rent obtainable in the interim during which he contemplates holding it?

(2) Does Ricardo's doctrine admit that the land owned by the margin of cultivation is appropriated, or are the margins of appropriation and cultivation identical? I ask this question to settle a disputed point with several students of "Progress and Poverty."

A STUBBORN INQUIRER.
(1) He has no inducement to keep it out of use; but, on the other hand, he has no sufficient inducement to put it to use. The land is worth in the market a certain price; he will not sell it for less than that price, and if he rents it, he expects a rental based on that price. Both the price and the rent are for the time being more than a user can afford to pay. Therefore, having no customers, he allows the land to lie idle, or, what is the same thing, except in degree, he does not use it to its capacity.

There are in upper New York acres of city lots; the owners will not sell, and while they would be willing to rent for building purposes, no one will hire for such purposes at the rent demanded. So the owners rent to gardeners who pay all the land is worth for gardening purposes, but not so much as it is worth for building purposes. I have in mind a tract of woodland in an agricultural district which belongs to a farm. If the trees were cut and the stumps removed this woodland would make excellent truck land. The owner is not able to bear the expense of clearing, and the land is unused. He will not sell it because he expects a rise in land values in his neighborhood. He might rent it to workmen in parcels, but his terms are too onerous to tempt

them. And yet if that land were taxed at its actual value as land, the owner could not afford to keep it idle, and there are plenty of workingmen who would clear it for their own use if they were assured of undisputed enjoyment so long as they paid the land value tax. In the Pennsylvania oil district there is a tract of land which belongs to an English family. It is taxed low as mountain land; but if any one wanted to open a well he must agree to the terms of the English family; and when his well is bored his land is taxed high while that around him is taxed as low as before. In the coal fields of Pennsylvania there are thousands of acres of unopened coal mines which no one is permitted to open, which have a high value as coal lands, and which pay a small tax as agricultural lands.

It seems to me you are giving yourself a good deal of trouble about an abstraction, when you have only to open your eyes to see, respecting all kinds of land, that though the owners are not all members of one syndicate, valuable land is held out of use. From this fact it follows that the margin of production falls below its natural limit, and that is all there is to the question.

(2) The margin of appropriation and the margin of production are not necessarily identical. Robinson Crusoe appropriated his island, but the land of the island remained below the margin of production nevertheless. So long as any appropriated land is no better, all things considered, than land that is not appropriated, the appropriated land will be below the margin of production; but appropriated land which, all things considered, is better than any land that is not appropriated, is above the margin of cultivation.

Protection and Strikes.
NEW YORK.—Will you kindly inform me: (1) Where can I find authorities and proofs for the statements concerning the increase in duty on cheap grades of bottles in the year 1883, and (2) the strikes or lockouts following this measure, spoken of in the first column, second page of THE STANDARD of March 10?
EDWARD FRIDENBERG.

(1) In the federal statistics of that year.
(2) At the Astor library, in the newspapers of the time.

Money.
NEW YORK.—I note in your last issue, in answering "A Reader," you state that money is merely a counter of exchange. Having always supposed true money to be gold and silver coin and actual wealth or merchandise, and paper money only a representative thereof, I find difficulty in understanding Mr. George's references to our coinage and storage of silver as "the folly of digging silver out of one hole in the ground and burying it in another." Will you kindly refer me to a clear exposition of the position taken?
GEORGE A. HOLMES.

Read chapter 3 of "Protection or Free Trade?" being the chapter entitled "Confusions Arising from the Use of Money."

Effect of Tariffs.
ALDEN, N. Y.—Do I see the tariff eat a right? Goods represent labor; consequently when goods are low compared with gold, labor is low compared with gold. If I buy a pair of boots at \$2.50 gold and pay the bootblack five cents gold for a shine, when I can get the same boots at 50 cents gold I may pay the bootblack only one cent gold, and it will be the same with the bootblack as it was before.

If I am correct, then the tariff does not affect the price of goods any further than to denominate the price of labor in that country.
J. C. CLARK.

You are right in your statement, and if the tariff were an equal ad valorem tax on everything you would be right in your conclusion also. But as the tariff bears unequally, some things being heavily taxed, others lightly and others not at all, money wages generally are governed by money wages in the production of the untaxed article, which puts the workman at a disadvantage when he buys an article on which the tax is imposed.

How to Get Rid of the Surplus.
CHICAGO.—I have been a deeply interested reader of THE STANDARD for several weeks, and the following questions have occurred to me as the result.

If the rental value of the land on which a city is built is the creation of the people of such city, and therefore justly belongs to the community as a whole; and if such value ought to be and should be collected for the benefit of all the people, and the total amount so collected should exceed the sum required to pay the debts and current necessary (and only necessary) expenses of the city government economically administered, how under the workings of the single tax theory as advanced by you, if exercised to the extent of levying a tax to the full amount of the land or rental value, would you dispose of the excess alluded to, be such excess great or little?
J. H. WALKER.

It is refreshing to hear from a correspondent who fears that the single tax will raise too much revenue. It reminds one of old times, just after "Progress and Poverty" appeared, and before the Harbises and the Sims and the rest of them who, when one objection proves shaky invent another equally untenable, had discovered "statistically" that the tax would not raise revenue enough. You are behind in the literature of the discussion.

The proposition is to tax land values and land values alone. If such a tax does not raise as much revenue as we raise now, we must reduce our expenses. But it cannot raise more than we need. Fixed sums, according to public necessity, would be called for as now, and these sums could be, and when the benefits of taxing land values for public use were appreciated, no doubt would be, increased until practically no land value would be left to the owner. But the sums would not be increased arbitrarily; they would be increased in response to public demand for public improvements.

Silencing the Single Tax Theory.
BROOKLYN.—Will you be pleased to republish the article in THE STANDARD of this week, entitled "The Tenant Farmer of the West," in connection with answers to the following questions:

(1) Knowing from experience that the article referred to is substantially true, and that the landlords in the country are in the condition set forth, I desire to know how it is possible for such a mighty "land monopoly" to exist as is claimed by THE STANDARD?
(2) With this state of facts how is it possi-

ble to so increase the tax on land as to raise \$800,000,000 of taxes on land alone annually to run the general and state governments?
(3) If the landlord farmer makes but eighty cents per day for his labor and capital with which to support his family, employ labor, pay taxes, buy seeds, tools, blacksmith work, clothing and food with absolute free trade, whence will come the enormous increase of taxes to defray the whole expense of government?
(4) Please explain the rental value of these farming lands aside from labor and improvements.

(5) Would any man, syndicate or trust take the farming lands of the United States and pay for the labor and improvements?
(6) To my mind this simple showing ought to be sufficient to forever silence the absurd single tax theory.
I. V. F.

(1) THE STANDARD is not so short of material as to find it necessary to reproduce its articles; but to make your questions intelligible I will state the substance of the article to which you refer. It was quoted from the New York Times and showed that one-half of the farms of Michigan are mortgaged; that the assessed value of Michigan's farms is \$700,000,000; that this is one-third of the actual value; that the amount of mortgages is about \$350,000,000; that the ten agricultural states of the Mississippi valley are in about the same condition, and are consequently mortgaged for about \$3,422,000,000, their actual value being about \$13,931,000,000; and that the produce of the farms of these states will not, after paying interest on the mortgages, leave enough for the farmers to live on. These are the facts which you say from your experience are substantially true, and how, in face of such facts you can ask the question you do is puzzling? When the owners of land (called mortgages in this article) are able to rack rent their tenants to such an extent as to leave too little for the tenants to live on, the average man would infer the existence of a pretty "mighty land monopoly." Perhaps you are not an average man.

(2) A tax on land values alone would lessen the taxes of farmers and increase those of mine owners, forest owners and owners of valuable city lots. These farms are assessed at one-third of their actual value. That is in all probability about the value of the naked land. Therefore, Michigan farmers are now paying as high taxes on their farms as they would be called on to pay under the single tax. They are now paying taxes on what they buy as well. The single tax, therefore, would reduce their contributions to the public revenue without any change in the value of land. But as that tax would make it unprofitable to keep land out of use, a great deal of unused land would be thrown upon the market, with the effect of reducing land values generally and making the tax burden of the farmers lighter still.

Since the farmers are taxed on a valuation of one-third, other real estate is probably taxed on the same basis, or less. Thus, a man who owns a mine worth \$100,000, now pays on a valuation of one-third of \$10,000, or on \$37,000 in round numbers. Under the single tax he would pay on a valuation of \$100,000. I have no doubt that a great deal of valuable lumber land pays taxes on less than one-third of its value; under the single tax such land would pay on its full value. And in cities there are vacant lots the tax on which is based upon a low valuation; under the single tax it would be based on a full valuation. Your experience in the west will enable you to see from these suggestions that a single tax on land values would increase the taxes of men who monopolize natural opportunities and diminish the taxes of men who earn their living by work. Whether the single tax would raise eight hundred millions or not, I do not know, nor do I care. It is enough to know that it will raise all that the land on which it falls is worth, and that the tax so raised would go into the public treasury instead of going, as it does now—into the pockets of land owners. Land is now taxed to its full value, the tax, less what goes to the state, going to landlords; and the value is artificially increased by cornering land. If all land not in use were free, as it would be under the single tax, no land would have an artificial value, and no one would pay a higher tax for his land than the superior advantages that land gave him would enable him to pay. But under our present system, land being made scarce by speculation, land in use is abnormally valuable and consequently is excessively taxed.

(3) The farmer, under absolute free trade, would make more than eighty cents a day.

The farmer is not the only man who uses land.

There would not be an "enormous increase of taxes to defray the whole expense of government," but an enormous decrease. All taxes would be the annual price of superior natural opportunities.

If one man worked a mine that produced ten annually with given labor and capital, and another worked a mine that produced five annually with the same labor and capital, the first man would pay five more in taxes than the second. This difference now goes to a mine owner; it would then go to the people. If the value of all such advantages in the country was not enough to meet public expenses—public expenses would have to be cut down.

(4) How can I explain the rental value of these farming lands without knowing the value of the improvements? John's coat and trousers are worth \$15; how much is his coat worth? Answer me that riddle and I will answer you yours.

(5) I think so, and I am sure they would take all the lands of the United States on those conditions.

(6) If your mind is to be judged by your questions, your confession of opinion need occasion no surprise.

Mat Making and Free Trade.

NORTH NEW YORK.—I have twice voted the united labor ticket, from top to bottom the last time, and am a believer in the efficacy of the single tax, and hence a free trader, understanding that, while a free interests in trade may be crippled, the vast majority of the people will be benefited. But for the enlightenment of others as well as myself I want to put a question, which, as a reader of THE STANDARD, I am sure will receive a

frank, if not to us a satisfactory, answer, or at least an agreeable one.
They and I are mat weavers—all kinds—door mats, ordinary floor matting, etc. Now the raw material is spun in the East Indies, comes to England, where the best of the stock is bought up, manufactured and sent to the New York market, and sold cheaper than we can manufacture it. Now, how would absolute free trade operate in this particular trade?
GEO. W. RODEX.

Assuming that mat weavers in England could make up the material and ship it to this country for sale at a less price than you could make it up and sell it for, absolute free trade would make it more profitable for you, both with reference to your present condition and your condition then, to do some other kind of work. The more mats and carpets England sent to this country the more products of this country would require in return. This would increase the demand for work in this country in a way that would make it very easy and more profitable for you to find employment in some other direction.

But are you sure that England could undersell you in our market if we had free trade? As I am not sufficiently familiar with your trade to know what your raw material is I cannot make any comparison of the duty of twenty per cent on mats and matting, which is imposed for your "protection," with the duty on your raw material, which, if there is a duty, is certainly imposed to your injury; but you can readily ascertain what the duty on your raw material is and make the comparison yourself.

Of this, however, you may be sure, that the "few interests in trade," which, as you say, "may be crippled" by free trade, will not be the interests of people who work, but the interests of those who profit by the unrequited labor of others.

Notes.

GEORGE F. LEWIS, Victor, Iowa.—Your difficulties are appreciated. With their ignorance of the incidence of taxation, it is to be expected that they will at first imagine that the single tax will increase their burdens and lighten those of the "capitalist." Get them to read tracts relating to farmers, and ask them to explain why "capitalists" are so bitterly opposed to the single tax and so suddenly anxious for the welfare of the poor farmer.

LOUIS F. POST.

AN UNCONSCIOUS APOSTLE.

The Saginaw Evening News gives a very full account of a lecture by the Rev. Rowland Connor, delivered on Feb. 25, in the Unitarian church of that city, on "Henry George's theory of nationalization of land." The News says of the lecture that it consisted "in the main of a clear, succinct line of argument, disproving many of George's assertions, showing how careless he must have been in compiling his statistics, and the erroneous conclusions arrived at as to our present social position." The following extracts from the News's report are good illustrations of the clearness, succinctness and logic of the reverend gentleman's discourse.

Now look at our present condition, our modern civilization into which George says a wedge has entered, thrusting one class of people down and another up. Look at the vast middle classes, which constitute the great bulk and weight of the nation, of whom only a thin stratum at the bottom are very poor and a thin stratum at the top very rich. We all know this by ordinary observation, reading of newspapers, etc., and see that George is in error when he asserts to the contrary and indulges in his peculiar pessimistic views.

Now what George says does not agree with the facts. According to him, in a progressive community, land owners only can get rich, capital and labor remain just where they were. He never refers in his books to the bloated bondholder, of whose existence he must be aware. I know lots of them. Yes, reiterates George, land owners only get rich, and all increased production will be swallowed up by rent, while wages remain as before. Will it be too harsh if I simply say, nonsense? We can enumerate plenty of brokers, bankers, merchants, railroad magnates and speculators, all kinds who are immensely wealthy. George never specifies such rich men who are so well known in this country. Only a few families have made their money out of the increase in the value of land, while on the other hand large numbers have made vast fortunes in the other businesses I have specified.

There are three classes that derive profits from industry—land owners, laborers and capitalists. George says that what goes to the landlords must lessen what goes to the other two; undoubtedly that is true, and living, if there were no rents to pay, would be cheaper for most persons for a time. But look at the one class which is the most numerous, the laborers. If all land must be taxed up to its full rental value. Now, how would that help the poor people? What would the government do with it?

The speaker, however, by a natural chain of reasoning that the metals, wool and numerous articles that are used in our industries are as much nature's bounty as land itself and subject to the same rulings as land is correct. He showed the folly of George's reasoning on such a standpoint. George says, continued Mr. Connor, that when a man digs a lump of gold out of the ground and utilizes it, don't tax it, but tax the hole it came from. George's theories go to pieces when closely examined.

The speaker discoursed of the evil that has been done in allowing foreign syndicates to purchase thousands of acres of land in this country. He urged the workmen to insist on action being taken on the bill that has been presented to prevent it, closing in an eloquent manner on the bright future of this country that impressed his hearers with his oratorical abilities and earnest sincerity.

The single tax cause will gain plenty of adherents in Saginaw. If the Rev. Rowland Connor can only be induced to keep on lecturing against it.

Crime Detected After Many Years.

CALIS, Me., Advertiser.
In the fall of 1881 the American schooner P. L. Higgins, then owned by E. A. Barnard & Son and others of Calais, in the passage from Philadelphia for Calais with coal, struck on the rocks near the passage. The vessel, the master, after consultation with the managing owner, had the vessel sold at auction. The current is swift where the vessel lay, and if strong winds had occurred the vessel would have been taken on the bill that had been presented to prevent it, closing in an eloquent manner on the bright future of this country that impressed his hearers with his oratorical abilities and earnest sincerity.

THE PROPOSED JOINT CONFERENCE.

SHARON, Conn., March 19.—In your issue of March 3 you publish a circular from Mr. Samuel W. Williams, urging those interested in the idea of the single tax to write to Mr. Warren Worth Bailey of Chicago, authorizing him to issue a call for a conference to be held on the fourth of July.

It seemed to us that the idea embodied in that circular was a very good one and we are very much disappointed not to find such a call in the last number of THE STANDARD.

Our movement is just now at a very critical point, and it is necessary for all of us who have accepted this idea, to get together and have a very free and frank discussion as to ways and means of bringing this great principle before the people.

There is really very little organization among our friends, many of them being scattered and comparatively isolated. These men could have no representation in a delegate conference, and, apart from this fact, what we want is a really general consensus of individual opinion and that can best be secured in a mass meeting of our friends.

The call for a conference-convention on May 15, issued by the committees at Cooper union, does not, it seems to us, deserve the attention of earnest men. Because from the fact of its being called at the same time and place as the convention of the union labor party, and in view of the utterances of a majority of those who signed the call, it is clearly an attempt to gather all the dissatisfied elements in the country for the purpose of forming a party, and not a bona fide effort to bring together the advocates of the single tax as such, for the purpose of a free discussion as to the most effective method of enlightening our fellow citizens on this great subject, and especially as to whether it would be better for us to nominate a national ticket or not. This we think can be most satisfactorily accomplished through such a conference as that proposed by Mr. Williams, and we sincerely hope that Mr. Bailey will as quickly as possible issue a call for a general conference on the fourth of July, and we would suggest Chicago as probably the most convenient place for all concerned.
J. L. DUNHAM,
GEO. ST. J. LEAVENS.

THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.

A Place in Which the Doctrine of Private Land Ownership is Secure a Generation Old.

Lewis, Christian Commonwealth.
Few men know the highlands better, or are better known and respected by the highlanders, than Mr. John Murdoch. The following account of some of the historical and religious aspects of the great movement among the Scotch crofters, specially written by Mr. Murdoch for the "Anti-Poverty" columns of the Christian Commonwealth, will, therefore, be read with interest at this time. Mr. Murdoch speaks of that which he knows, and testifies of that which he has seen, for he has recently visited the very districts in which the "raids" are now taking place.

In the first place, the island of Lewis, which, by the way, is the native of William Black's "Princess of Thule," is in a more than ordinarily favorable position for holding forth the idea that the land belongs, not to a landlord, but to the people. The Morrison chiefs, the MacLeod leaders, and the Mackenzie "Seafarths" whatever they may have asserted in Edinburgh or London when among the representatives of the grantees of Charles II., would not have dared to assert that the lands of Lewis or of Kintail belonged to any one man in particular. The land belonged to the clansmen, and the great men at their head held sway by virtue of their chieftainship. It is not worth while going further into this part of the question than to say that for a long time there was a struggle going on between this clan or patriarchal system and the feudal-commercial system of landholding, which has been fully established in the highlands since the battle of Culloden. The possession of a bit of land is a moral force; it is more than even Arthur Young thought of when he lauded the "margin of property"; and the moral force is all the greater when the possession is held to be a matter of natural right, and in no degree dependent upon purchase.

We have thus dawning on us one of the forces now at work in the highlands. The Lewis people have this force strengthened by the historic fact that their island never was a marketable commodity until some forty or forty-four years ago, when the trustees of the late "Seafarth" Mackenzie sold the island to Mr. (afterward Sir James) Matheson. To this hour this mercantile transaction has not lost its bad odor, although, no doubt, Seafarth did some things which were as fraudulent as any perpetrated since, although they were not so audacious. One of the aspects of the conjuncture thus presented has often come before the present generation of Lewismen in the claim of the Mathesons to exact rent. From a commercial point of view it seems very reasonable that the man who lays out money, as the buyers of estates have done, should recover sufficient interest on the money invested; but the question arises at once, What right had the Seafarth trustees to sell the people's land? And what right had the Mathesons to look to a third party to implement a bargain between a first and a second? The believer in usury has been staggered when the crofters have said to him, "A sells to B, and B comes to C for the interest on the investment." This, of course, is only one way out of many in which the validity of landlord claims can be set aside. The next matter which comes before the mind is the development of the moral courage, the sense of duty and the religious enthusiasm to carry out the convictions formed.

This, much more than mere intelligence, is the great desideratum all over the three kingdoms; and it is not too much to say that when something of the kind shows itself even far away in Lewis, the real leaders of English thought will, I am sure, hail it with all their hearts. Now, while the misleading papers do their utmost to associate the doings in Lewis with mere selfish, barbarous lawlessness, the fact is that the whole of the present movement is traceable to well reasoned religious convictions and pious sentiments. The lever of social reform has been laid on the fulcrum of religious thought and feeling. This movement is one of the first examples in modern times of man laying hold of the apostolic teaching that "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is as well as that which is to come," and making a direct application of the principle underlying it. These people are not "political economists" in the ordinary acceptance of the term, but they reach much more directly what the economists aim at. Then there is another noteworthy circumstance, viz., that at the very outset of the social and economic movement there is beyond all question an elevation of character and a manifestation of the noblest and most groveling scramble for personal advantage.

Besides having the traditions which I have mentioned, they are remarkably devout and

bible reading men. They have laid firm hold of the teachings of God in regard to the land. The land was given to the children of men, and the injunction that they were to support themselves and their families by tilling it. They caught firm hold of this as a divine command. It was true, they might possibly suffer much themselves individually from want of land, and all that land yields; but they were confronted with the leading element in true religion—the visiting of the fatherless and the widow. So far from their religion requiring them to stand by while their dependents were perishing, it impelled them to go where God ordered them—to the land, and from it, by the sweat of their brows, take that with which they were to visit the widow and fatherless in the affliction of poverty. But then there was a lion in the way. If they did this they would be conceiving of God to obey him rather than God, judge ye? There was a still deeper thought to which they gave heed. Their profession as Christian men implied that love had cast out fear. They were not to allow the fear of man to check them in the true carrying out of their love of God—loving God by doing good to men.

And without going any further in this groove, it is to be noticed that when they came into contact with the force of the law, they did not defend themselves, they did not resist; evil, they went remarkably near to turning the other cheek when they actually showed their willingness to go to prison. It is evident that in doing this they had an eye to making the system with which they were at issue odious in the public estimation. In other words, they went as directly at "the land" as they possibly could in the circumstances, and they took care not to sully their hands or their cause by resorting to any kind of rowdiness or lawlessness.

THE RESULT OF A RECRUIT SUBSCRIPTION.

NEW YORK.—Among my friends is an exceedingly bright and intelligent lady, the teacher of a girl's school. I have several times in the course of conversation found her strongly opposed to the single tax doctrine, and finding her apparently impervious to such arguments as I had time to advance, I told her I would have a copy of THE STANDARD sent her. She protested that she did not want such a paper; had no time to read it, etc., etc., but I nevertheless sent in her name for a recruit subscription. How well this recruit subscription seems to have done its work, and how through her many other minds are likely to be set thinking may be judged from the note I have recently received from her:

NEW YORK CITY.—My Dear Friend: Knowing how much you are interested in Henry George and the principles he advocates, you will enjoy hearing of a conversation which took place in my class room a few days ago. We were reading about the earth as a planet and the ancient theories respecting it, and when we read how the Prussian astronomer, Copernicus, after a labor of years succeeded in proving the ancient theory a mistake, I wanted to impress the pupils with the man's daring and courage, and said, "Suppose some one to-day should come forward trying to prove our knowledge of the moon a mistake, would you be ready or willing to believe him?"

From the distant corner came the answer "No, we would call him a crank." When the laughter that this aroused had died away, I asked "Do you know of any one who is called a crank?" Immediately a chorus of voices answered, "Henry George!"

We then turned and allowed the children to give their opinion of the man, with the following result: One said, "he doesn't want any one to be rich" another, "he wants the people to give up all their own while a third declared that he was an anarchist." I could not allow the last remark to go unexplained, but after I had shown the meaning of that word I tried the still more difficult task of explaining the meaning of "unearned increment." I did this by using the following illustration: "Fifty years ago a certain Mr. B. died leaving a farm situated in that part of New York city which to-day includes all property between the fourth and forty-seventh streets, the North and East rivers to the oldest son he left the portion between the North river and Seventh avenue, and to the youngest from the third avenue to the East river. The son who inherited the land remained idle until to-day, and now wishing to sell, each divides his portion into building lots. 'Which son would receive the highest price for his land and why?' the answer came quickly, 'The second son, because his property is in the most valuable part of the city.'"

"Did any word of either father or sons make these portions more or less valuable?" I asked.

"No," was the prompt answer.

"From whom did the value come?" I asked again, and without a dissenting voice the answer was, "The people."

After a little more conversation the girls all agreed that as neither father nor sons had made the present value of these lots, it did not belong to them, but to the masses who had created it.

When they had unanimously expressed this opinion I quietly said, "What girls, you are all cranks, for you have the same ideas about this land question that Henry George has." Then bedlam followed! And order was not restored until the bell rang for dismissal. Even then the girls clustered in eager discussion. Very truly yours,

As the receipt of this little note has encouraged me, so I think it will encourage others. There is much against us—custom, power, false teaching and misrepresentation. But we have truth on our side, and all that it is necessary for us to do is to get people to think. We cannot always see what we do; but we may always be certain that when we have aroused one mind, we have set at work a living and growing force. Even if the usefulness of my friend were to end here—and she is not that kind of a woman—her questions have given an impetus to young minds and it is certain to lead to ever widening circles. So much for our recruit subscription to THE STANDARD. Let us be patient and active.

As it was in the time of Copernicus, so it is now. Another great truth—and to human welfare a far greater truth—than that this earth revolves around the sun has entered the world. And it is here to stay. As Charles Mackay sings:

Keep, Galileo, to thy thought,
And nerve thyself to bear;
They may gloat o'er the senseless words they write,
From the pangs of thy despair.

They veil their eyes, but cannot hide
The sun's meridian glow;
The heel of a priest may tread thee down,
And a tyrant work thee woe.

But never a truth has been destroyed,
They may curse it and call it a crime;
Pervert and betray or slander and slay
Their teachers for a time.

But the sunshine ay shall light the sky,
As round and round we run,
And the truth shall ever come uppermost,
And justice shall be done.

AUGUST LEWIS.

The rate of taxation for the current year will unquestionably be increased, and it may be over \$20 per thousand. Such an increase would be to deprive the poor of the first place it will be taken in the visible property and existing enterprises in the second place, it serves to deter outside capital from investing within our limits—[Manchester, Mass., Budget.]

LOOSE LAND TENURE.

James Love of Burlington, Iowa, sends to THE STANDARD the prospectus of a real estate title insurance company recently established in a northwestern city, together with a pamphlet issued by the society designed to illustrate the insecurity of land tenure under existing laws. This insecurity is dwelt upon in the prospectus, which declares that "few titles are absolutely perfect," and that these imperfections "jeopardize the peaceable possession and ready transfer of real estate." The insurance company offers to guarantee the title to any property, subject to the conditions set forth in the deeds, but does not insure against the tenancy of personal occupants, rights of the public in streets not recorded or taxes and assessments not payable at the time the policy is issued. These are wise and prudent reservations, since, morally, actual occupants and the public are the only persons having any right to land.

Insurance companies of this kind are rapidly springing up in all parts of the country, and their existence offers a significant commentary on the questionable soundness of such titles, and the lack of any moral standard for determining the rightfulness of claims to the ownership of land. Such moral standards are easily found for determining disputes as to the ownership of all property created by human effort, and the offer of a corporation to insure to men their title to their coats or hats would be met with derision. The very reason for the existence of land title insurance companies is found in the fact that land titles are entirely arbitrary and technical, having their origin solely in law and not in natural right, and that therefore no man can be sure whether he owns land or not, even the sense of security given by the law of adverse possession often proving fallacious.

Under the single tax system land tenure would be much more secure than it now is. "Actual possession," which the prospectus quoted declares "is often a valuable feature in the protection of a title," would soon become the only title so long as the taxes due to the community were paid; and the contingency of non-payment of taxes now exists and is one against which even the title insurance companies refuse to insure. Most title deeds, within the limits of the territory, are made by the great first survey, and the records of centuries would not have to be ransacked to ascertain the right of a man to continue to occupy a home acquired by the proceeds of his own labor. Furthermore, considerations of justice would prevail in the settlement of all disputes, and we should see nothing of that ruthless sacrifice of the rights of "innocent third parties," so common in the decision of suits about land titles, but about which we hear such an outcry whenever any proposal is made for the recovery of property stolen from the public and transferred to others by the original thieves.

Under the single tax system, carried to its legitimate conclusion, there could not arise any such game of chance as is described in the pamphlet sent out by the insurance company under consideration. The story was briefly told in an early issue of THE STANDARD, but those who remember it will not object to having it given more fully. It is as follows:

THE HISTORY OF A TITLE.

Of the locality of the parcel of real estate, the history of the title of which it is proposed to relate, it may be sufficient to say that it lies in Boston, within the limits of the territory surveyed by the great first survey of November 9 and 10, 1822. In 1820 this parcel of land was in the undisturbed possession of Mr. William Ingalls, who referred his title to it to the will of his father, Mr. Thomas Ingalls, who died in 1820. Mr. Ingalls, the elder, had been a very wealthy citizen of Boston; and when he made his will, a few years before his death, he owned this one parcel of real estate worth about \$50,000, and possessed, in addition, personal property to the amount of between \$200,000 and \$300,000. By his will he specifically devised this parcel of land to his wife for life, and after her death, to his only child, the William Ingalls before mentioned, in fee, to whom, after directing his executor to pay to two nephews, William and Arthur Jones, the sum of \$25,000 each, he gave also the large residue of his property. After the death of his will, however, Mr. Thomas Ingalls engaged in some unfortunate speculations, and upon the settlement of his estate the personal property proved to be barely sufficient for the payment of his debts, and the real estate, however, afforded to the widow a comfortable income, which enabled her during her life to support herself in a respectable manner. Upon her death, in 1845, the son entered into possession of the estate, which had gradually increased in value; and he had been enjoying for fifteen years a handsome income derived therefrom, when he was one day surprised to hear that the two nephews, whom his father had benevolently remembered in his will had advanced a claim that this real estate should be sold by his father's executor and the proceeds applied to the payment of their legacies. This claim, now first made thirty years after the death of his father, was of course a great surprise to Mr. Ingalls. He had entertained the popular idea that twenty years' possession effectually cut off all claims. Here, however, were parties, after thirty years' undisputed possession by his mother and himself, setting up in 1860 a claim arising out of the will of his father, that will having been proved in 1820. Nor had Mr. Ingalls ever dreamed that the legacies given to his nephews could in any way have precedence over the specific devise of the parcel of real estate to himself. It was, as a matter of common sense, so clear that his father had intended by his will, first to provide for his wife and son, and then to make a generous gift of the residue of his estate to his nephews, that during the thirty years that had elapsed since his death it had never occurred to any one to suggest any other disposal of the property than that which had been actually made. Upon consulting with counsel, however, Mr. Ingalls learned that although the time within which most actions might be brought was limited to a specified number of years, there was no such limitation affecting the bringing of an action to recover a legacy. See Mass. Gen. St., c. 97, sec. 23; Kent v. Dunham, 104 Mass., 594, 595; Brooks v. Lynde, 7 Allen, 61, 66. He also learned that as his father's will gave him, after his mother's death, the same estate that he would have taken by inheritance had there been no will, the law looked upon the devise to him as void, and deemed him to have taken the estate by descent. What he had supposed to be a specific devise of the estate to him was then a void devise, or no devise at all; and his parcel of real estate, being in the eye of the law simply a part of an undivided residue, was of course liable to be sold for the payment of the legacies contained in his father's will. It was assets which the executor was bound to apply to that purpose. This exact point had been determined in the then recent case of Ellis v. Page, 7 Cush, 161; and Mr. Ingalls, who was a man of business, as he usually did in all financial operations, in which he had enjoyed for so many years, sold at auction by the executor of his father's will

for \$125,000, not quite enough to pay the legacies to his nephews, which legacies were to be paid from the residue of one year after the date of the sale in 1862 to \$143,000. The Messrs. Jones themselves purchased the estate at the sale, deeming the purchase a good investment of the amount of their legacies, and Mr. Ingalls instituted a system of stricter economy in his domestic expenses, and pondered much on the uncertainty of the law and the mutability of human affairs.

By one of those curious coincidences which so often occur, Messrs. William and Arthur Jones had scarcely begun to enjoy the increased supply of pocket money afforded them by the rents of their newly acquired property when they each received one morning a summons to appear before the justices of the superior court, "to answer unto John Rogers in a writ of entry," the premises described in the writ being their newly acquired estate.

The Messrs. Jones were at first rather startled by this unexpected proceeding; but as they had, when they received their deed from Mr. Ingalls' executor, taken the precaution to have the title to their estate examined by a conveyancer, who had reported that he had carried his examination as far back as the beginning of the century, and found the title perfectly clear and correct, they took courage and waited for further developments. It was not long, however, before the facts upon which the writ of entry had been founded were made known. It appeared that for some time prior to 1750 the estate had belonged to one John Buttolph, who died in that year, leaving a will in which he devised the estate "to my brother Thomas, and if he should die without issue, then I give the same to my brother William." Thomas Buttolph had held the estate until 1773, when he died, leaving an only daughter, Mary, at that time the wife of Timothy Rogers. Mrs. Rogers had the estate until 1790, when she died, leaving two sons and a daughter. This estate she devised to her daughter, who subsequently, in 1800, conveyed it to Mr. Thomas Ingalls, before mentioned. Peter Rogers, the oldest son of Mrs. Rogers, was a non-compos, but lived until the year 1854, when he died at the age of 75. He left no children, having never been married. John Rogers, the defendant in the writ of entry, was the eldest son of John Rogers, the second son of Mrs. Mary Rogers, and the title set up by him was substantially as follows: He claimed that under the decision in Hayward v. Howe, 13 Gray, 43, the will of John Buttolph had given to Thomas Buttolph and to his heirs or assigns, and to the heirs of the testator to have been that the estate should belong to Thomas Buttolph and to his issue as long as such issue should exist, but that upon the failure of such issue, whenever such failure might occur, whether at the death of Thomas or at any subsequent time, the estate should go to William Buttolph. It had also been decided in Corbin v. Healy, 20 Pick., 514, 516, that an estate tail does not descend in Massachusetts, like other real estate, to all the children of the deceased owner, in equal shares, but according to the old English rule, exclusively to the oldest son, if any, and to the daughters only in default of him; and it had been further decided in Hall v. Priest, 8 Gray, 18, 24, that an estate tail cannot be devised or in any way affected by the will of a tenant in tail. Mr. John Rogers claimed then that the estate tail given by the will of John Buttolph to Thomas Buttolph had descended at the death of Thomas to his only child, Mary Rogers; that at her death, instead of passing, as had been supposed at the time, by virtue of her will, to her daughter, that will had been wholly without effect upon the estate, which had, in fact, descended to her oldest son, Peter Rogers; that Peter Rogers had indeed been deceased in 1800, if not before, but that his sister in tail, possessing of and conveying away the estate, but as he was a non-compos during the whole of his long life, the statute of limitations did not begin to run against him, and his heir in tail, namely, John Rogers, the oldest son of his then deceased brother, John, was allowed by Mass. Gen. Stat., chap. 154, sec. 5, ten years after his uncle Peter's death, within which to bring his action. As these ten years did not expire until 1840, this action, brought in 1862, was seasonably commenced; and it was prosecuted with success, judgment in his favor having been recovered by John Rogers in 1864.

The case of Rogers v. Jones was naturally a subject of remark among the legal profession; and it happened to occur to one of the younger members of that profession that it would be well to improve some of his idle moments by studying up the facts of this case. A Suffolk registry of deeds and of probate. Curiosity prompted this gentleman to extend the investigation beyond the facts directly involved in the case, and to trace the title to John Buttolph, from its origin to the date. He found that Mr. Buttolph had purchased the estate in 1730 of one Hosea Johnson, to whom it had been conveyed in 1719 by Benjamin Parsons. The deed from Parsons to Johnson, however, conveyed the land to Johnson simply, without any mention of his "heirs"; and the young lawyer having recently read the case of Baile v. Hutchinson, 1 Allen, 55, perceived that Johnson took under this deed only a life estate in the granted premises, and that at his death the premises reverted to Parsons or his heirs. The young lawyer, being of the class comprising the popular idea that twenty years' possession effectually cut off all claims. Here, however, were parties, after thirty years' undisputed possession by his mother and himself, setting up in 1860 a claim arising out of the will of his father, that will having been proved in 1820. Nor had Mr. Ingalls ever dreamed that the legacies given to his nephews could in any way have precedence over the specific devise of the parcel of real estate to himself. It was, as a matter of common sense, so clear that his father had intended by his will, first to provide for his wife and son, and then to make a generous gift of the residue of his estate to his nephews, that during the thirty years that had elapsed since his death it had never occurred to any one to suggest any other disposal of the property than that which had been actually made. Upon consulting with counsel, however, Mr. Ingalls learned that although the time within which most actions might be brought was limited to a specified number of years, there was no such limitation affecting the bringing of an action to recover a legacy. See Mass. Gen. St., c. 97, sec. 23; Kent v. Dunham, 104 Mass., 594, 595; Brooks v. Lynde, 7 Allen, 61, 66. He also learned that as his father's will gave him, after his mother's death, the same estate that he would have taken by inheritance had there been no will, the law looked upon the devise to him as void, and deemed him to have taken the estate by descent. What he had supposed to be a specific devise of the estate to him was then a void devise, or no devise at all; and his parcel of real estate, being in the eye of the law simply a part of an undivided residue, was of course liable to be sold for the payment of the legacies contained in his father's will. It was assets which the executor was bound to apply to that purpose. This exact point had been determined in the then recent case of Ellis v. Page, 7 Cush, 161; and Mr. Ingalls, who was a man of business, as he usually did in all financial operations, in which he had enjoyed for so many years, sold at auction by the executor of his father's will

for \$125,000, not quite enough to pay the legacies to his nephews, which legacies were to be paid from the residue of one year after the date of the sale in 1862 to \$143,000. The Messrs. Jones themselves purchased the estate at the sale, deeming the purchase a good investment of the amount of their legacies, and Mr. Ingalls instituted a system of stricter economy in his domestic expenses, and pondered much on the uncertainty of the law and the mutability of human affairs.

By one of those curious coincidences which so often occur, Messrs. William and Arthur Jones had scarcely begun to enjoy the increased supply of pocket money afforded them by the rents of their newly acquired property when they each received one morning a summons to appear before the justices of the superior court, "to answer unto John Rogers in a writ of entry," the premises described in the writ being their newly acquired estate.

realized very little from the results of the suit, but the young lawyer obtained sufficient to establish him as a brilliant speculator in suburban lands, second mortgages and patent rights. Mr. Smith had been but a short time in possession of his new estate when the great fire of November, 1873, swept over it. He was, however, a most energetic citizen, and the ruins were not cold before he was at work rebuilding. He bought an adjoining lot in order to increase the size of his estate, the whole of which was soon covered by an elegant block, conspicuous on the front of which may now be seen his initials, "J. S.," cut in the stone.

While the estate which had once belonged to Mr. William Ingalls was passing from one person to another in the bewildering manner we have endeavored to describe, Mr. Ingalls had himself, for a time, looked on in amazement. It finally occurred to him, however, that he would go to the root of this matter of title. He employed a skillful conveyancer to trace the title back, if possible, to the book of possessions. The result of this investigation was that it appeared that the parcel which he had himself owned, together with the additional parcel bought and added to it by Smith, had in 1643 or 1644, when the book of possessions was compiled, constituted one parcel, which was then the "possession" of one "Maudie Engle," who subsequently, in 1650, under the name of "Maudie Engles," conveyed it to John Vorse, on the express condition that no building should ever be erected on a certain portion of the rear of the premises conveyed. Now it had so happened that this portion of these premises had never been built upon before the great fire, but Mr. Smith's new buildings had covered the whole of the forbidden ground. It was evident, then, that the condition had been broken; that the breach had occurred so recently that the right to enforce a forfeiture was not barred by the statute, and could not be deemed to have been waived by any neglect or delay; and that consequently, under the decision in Grey v. Blanchard, 8 Pick., 281, a forfeiture of the estate for breach of condition could now be enforced if the true parties entitled by descent and by residuary devise under the original "Engle" or "Engles" could only be found. It occurred to Mr. Ingalls, however, that the name, "Engles," bore a certain similarity in sound to his own; and as he had heard that during the early years after the settlement of this country great changes in the spelling of names had been brought about, he instituted an inquiry into his own genealogy, the result of which was, in brief, that he found he could prove himself to be an identical person engaged, as it were, to Maudie Engle, to the breach of the condition in the old deed of 1650, the forfeiture of the estate now in the possession of John Smith.

When Mr. Smith heard of these facts he felt that a retributive Nemesis was pursuing him. He lost the usual pluck and bulldog determination with which he had been accustomed to fight at the law all claims against him, whether just or unjust. He consulted the spirits; and they rapped out the answer that he must make the best settlement he could with Mr. Ingalls, or he would infallibly lose all his fine estate—not only that part which Mr. Ingalls had originally held, and which he had retained for almost nothing much since, but the adjoining parcel, for which he had paid his full value, together with the elegant building which he had erected at a cost exceeding the whole value of the land. Mr. Smith believed in the spirits; they had made a lucky guess once in answering an inquiry from him; he was getting old; he had worked like a steam engine during a long and busy life, but now his health and his digestion were giving out; and when the news of Mr. Ingalls' claim reached his ears he became, in a word, demoralized. He instructed his lawyer to make the best settlement of the matter that he could; and a settlement was soon effected by which the whole of Mr. Smith's parcel of land in the burnt district was conveyed to Mr. Ingalls, who gave back to Mr. Smith a mortgage for the whole amount which the latter had expended in the erection of his building, together with what he had paid for the parcel added by him to the original lot. Mr. Smith, not liking to have anything to remind him of his one unfortunate speculation, soon sold and assigned this mortgage to the Massachusetts hospital life insurance company; and as the well-known counsel of that institution has now examined and passed the title, we may presume that there are in it no more dangerous remainders to be discovered.

In conclusion, we may say that Mr. William Ingalls, after having been for some ten years a reviler of the law, especially of that portion of it which relates to the title to real estate, is now inclined to look more complacently upon it, being again in undisturbed and undisputed possession of his old estate, now worth much more than before, and in the receipt therefrom of an ample income which will enable him to pass the remainder of his days in comfort, if not in luxury. But, though Mr. Ingalls is content with the final result of the history of his title, these lawyers who are known as "conveyancers" are by no means happy when they contemplate that history, for it has tended to impress upon them how full of pitfalls is the ground upon which they are accustomed to tread, and how extensive is the knowledge and how great the care required of all who travel over it; and they now look more disgusted than ever when, as so often happens, they are requested to "just step over" to the registry and "look down" a title; and are informed that the title is a very simple one, and will only take a few minutes; and that so-and-so, "a very careful man," did it in less than half an hour last year and found it all right, and that his charge was \$5.

Our Father Says.

Untended and unseen,
Within a rock's rough crack a flower grew;
No life was in the rock-dust poor and mean,
It withered—why it sprouted none knew.

Neglected and bereft,
Of tender care, a little child was left;
The crowd of love was bare—the wee one fell,
Why it came here to suffer, none could tell.

The small green leaf
Climbed on a bird in its long, lonely flight;
The child life brief
Touched one brave heart ere twilight changed to night;
The bird took wing and flew to endless light,
And Greatheart gained new strength to war for right.

Yes, But It Doesn't Affect the Same Million.
Amsterdam, N. Y., Labor Stage.

Mr. Halstead is said to be "dead against the scheme of government telegraphy," whose leading proposition, he says, is to tax \$5,000,000 of the people of the United States for the benefit of the sixtieth million. On the same ground Mr. Halstead ought to be dead against the scheme of protection, whose only proposition is to the same effect.

Every obstruction to a free exchange of commodities is born of the same narrow and selfish spirit which planted castles upon the Rhine, and which erected barriers to commerce. Every obstruction to commerce is a tax on consumption. Every facility to a free exchange cheapens commodities, increases trade and production and promotes civilization.—SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN.

THE ADEQUACY OF THE SINGLE TAX ON LAND VALUES.

Thoughts Evoked by a Purely Abstract Consideration of Some of the Conditions Growing Out of the Application of the "Single Tax on Land Values" Proposed by Henry George.

NEW YORK.—A careful reader of THE STANDARD, and in constant communication with many co-believers in the "remedy" proposed by Mr. George, I have, however, noticed that while its justice is unquestioned, the adequacy of the tax to meet social wants is a matter of grave concern to many minds, some holding that the revenue therefrom will fall far short of, while others claim it will vastly exceed, the actual amount needed for public wants.

I have often fancied that the discussion of this question has proceeded along the line of concrete consideration to the almost entire ignoring of the fact that this is a proposition capable of abstract proof.

The attempt to handle a demonstrable abstract truth by adjusting and explaining the perturbing influences that enter into its practical application will always produce a degree of mental confusion and uncertainty, from which exhortation is extremely difficult and sometimes impossible, no matter how brightly the discerning, co-ordinating and eliminating processes of the mind may irradiate the subject, and irrespective of the fact that the individual may bring to his aid the principles of social ethics, philanthropy, religion and political precedent, the doubt will still remain as to whether it may not be "better to bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of."

Louis F. Post's reply to an inquirer who desired certain information without giving adequate data, "Why don't you ask me the length of a clothes line, and I will answer it as easily," is suggestive of the turgid condition of men's minds while trying to satisfy themselves by a concrete consideration of social phenomena.

Every circumstance or event is but the effect of antecedent causation, and the environment in which we find ourselves now is merely the resultant condition of the operation of causative processes through long ages, and which are, except in general principles, to-day unrecognizable.

If, then, it is possible to consider a supposed truth in the light of a pure abstraction, as we would geometrical propositions or algebraic problems, the logical mind obtains a relief and composure that gives it the courage to face its conclusions, and arms it with an irresistible power against its adversaries.

Pure, as distinguished from applied mathematics, deals with quantities and quantities in the abstract. It treats of magnitudes and numbers that are continually undetermined. If it speaks of points, lines, surfaces and solids, and their relations to numbers, its truths are applicable in practice, whether fields or houses, coal mines or ships, lunar eclipses or tramways, are to be considered.

In this light let us advance to a contemplation of one of the resultant conditions of the application of the single tax on land values, viz: the qualitative amount of revenue to be derived therefrom. This question has provoked much discussion, and varying opinions are entertained by George's followers, with the preponderance in favor of the belief that the revenue will be largely in excess of public wants.

Theorem: The single tax on land values as proposed by Henry George will be neither more nor less than absolutely adequate to provide for social wants.

In all sciences, so in social economy, the method of proof is inductive and never varying definition of terms. We must, therefore, explain what we mean by the terms land values and social wants and adhere strictly to our meaning.

Land values are certain values which land acquires as a result of the progression of society from the indefinite, incoherent condition of primitive homogeneity to the increasingly definite and coherent heterogeneity that marks each successive step of the progress, and which may be lessened or lost by a retrogression. (Land being understood to mean the whole available material universe, as well as natural forces external to man himself.)

Social wants are to be considered as dual in their nature; and comprising requirements (based on common necessities) and conveniences (based on common desires), and are the result of the same progress of society as stated in preceding paragraphs, and may be lessened or lost in the same manner. (Note that requirements must, while conveniences may, arise.)

These definitions may be considered as basic axioms of the economic science, but must be accepted as necessary postulates. The social wants of land values and social wants are at once apparent, as both are the effects of the same causes acting in parallel lines, or at least in the same general direction, and the measure of their growth of necessity relative (if not proportional), although the adequacy of the first to meet the second may not at once be patent to the mind not trained to think in principles and make intuitive leaps. It will, therefore be necessary to bridge the chasm and perfect a syllogism.

The extremes of mathematical parallelism are the tangent lines at diametrically opposite points to a circle whose radius is infinity, and the coincidence of the tangents when the radius is reduced to zero. If, therefore, we reduce the distance between the two lines on which land values and social wants press to zero, fix their beginning at the same point, and equalize the ratio of advances, we will have the quadrat demonstration.

To fully accomplish this we must enunciate our axioms or postulates, the first of which is that the standard of measure of land values is the same as that of social wants. In other words, the value of the opportunity is paid for (no matter who pays it or who receives it, the ethics of the subject having no place in this discussion) in the same currency in which the community pays for the satisfaction of its social wants. Human labor is the medium, and the unit of value in exchange the standard.

social requirements) more for the opportunity than the excess of what he can produce over and above his self-employment at a valueless opportunity, but being gregarious in his nature will consent to do that much, with a strong probability of his willingness to pay a value amount for social conveniences, and the extent of the opportunity is measured by the degree of social advantages it can afford his gregarious demands, and the increment of land values (measured by the same standard) will be identical as far as requirements are concerned (if not slightly in excess of in regard to conveniences) with the decrement of social wealth to maintain these advantages.

As men may consent to a further levy on their industry to supply social conveniences, land values will advance to meet the same, and it is even possible that, quantitatively considered, the increment of social wealth may at times be either greater or less than the expenditure for social wants; but the tendency must be practically to an equality, which in theory is absolute.

The initial points the direction of the movement, and the ratio of progress being identical the lines will coincide.

Note.—By social wealth must be understood not aggregate wealth, but that wealth which does not inhere in an individual, but is the common property of all.

Illustration of the Progressions.

A—B—C—D

Let A represent the point at which land values begin, and that their progression is along the line A B. Let C represent the point at which social wants begin, and that their progression is along the line C D.

As land values and social wants are produced by the progression from and to similar conditions of society, the direction of the lines must be parallel or approximately so, if not coincident, and will assume this relation.

A—B—C—D

The lines merely indicating the direction and not the ratio of progress or equivalence.

The initial point in both must coincide, as land values and social wants begin to be produced, only at the point where common desires spring into existence. The lines beginning then at the same point and having same direction must coincide or one be lost in the other and will assume this appearance, if the equivalence is not immediately patent:

A—B—C—D

As men will not pay more for social requirements (based on necessities) than the excess of their returns from the opportunity over what they can make at a valueless opportunity, the points B and D must have the same location and the lines will coincide thus:

A—B—C—D

As men may consent to pay more for the opportunity to obtain conveniences (based on desires) the effect would be to extend the point B of the L V line:

A—B—C—D

But as the decrement of social wants to gratify the convenience must keep pace with the desire, the tendency is for B and D to again approach each other and the lines to coincide. Thus:

A—B—C—D

READ GORDON.

Basting the Goose With the Gander's Sauce.

Manistee, Mich., Broadaxe.

We understand that the salt makers who recently met at Saginaw to consider what they would do about the tariff on salt, decided that if the tariff was taken off salt, they also wanted it taken off other things which they had to use in making salt. Oh, ah, yes, let us see—what is this for, any way? How is this thing, gentlemen? Why do you want it taken off things that you have to use? Is it possible that you have to have coal and turned cranks, by assuming the cranky doctrine that the tariff makes things high? Tut, tut, that will never do. Congressman Cutcheon and the other orthodox protective tariff fellows have put you down on the list of cranky right away. You all must certainly know better. Don't you know you have been claiming all along that the tariff on salt reduced salt from five dollars per barrel down to seventy cents? Don't you know that you have constantly dangled it into the ears of your laboring men, and proclaimed it from the house tops? Now, if the tariff has reduced salt, which you have to sell, to such an extent, why will it not also reduce the price of things you have to buy? And then, why should you object to taking the tariff off salt if you believe it will go up again to \$5 per barrel? Are you not now organized in a trades union salt association? Are you not now on a protracted strike as it were to compel your bosses—your employers, the people—to pay you more than the market price for salt? Have you not forced them by your trades union conspiracy to pay you seventy cents per barrel when the market value would be only about fifty cents? Now, if you want to make salt real high, if you want to raise it away up to \$5 per barrel (and you assume that free trade in salt will do that), for heaven's sake why don't you all go in for free trade in salt!

But come now, tell us the real truth just for once. Is it not a fact that you want tariff on what you have to sell (salt and lumber) because it makes those articles higher, and no tariff on what you have to buy (labor and other things) because it makes them cheaper? Of course you do. And if so, why complain if the laborer wants a tariff on what he has to sell (his labor), and no tariff on what he has to buy (your salt and lumber)? Now you have had what you want for one hundred years. Now suppose you give the laborer the same chance against you for only ten years—that you have had against him for one hundred years. He'd make puppets of you in less than five years, and then he'd be just like you do now, would turn around and swear that he accomplished it because of superior brains and business capacity.

But labor does not ask the advantage of you as you do of the farmer. If it asks it is to be allowed to stand up, fair and square, and look you in the face on a brotherhood plane of free trade and free opportunities. The God of justice will yield unto each one the honors and emoluments that merit entitles him to possess.

Think This Out.

Toronto, Labor Reformer.

When a big fire occurs and many buildings are destroyed we often hear the expression, "Well it's hard on the owners and the insurance companies, but it will be good for the building trade." This is it, it is a good thing for the workmen to get employment. Certainly no one will dispute this. Then, if the buildings are all rebuilt they are burned down again, it will be again a good thing for the building trade, and if in the large quantities of cotton and woolen goods and hardware are destroyed, that will be a good thing for the carders, spinners, weavers and hardware makers. Certainly it will be. There can be no doubt of that. And every time property is destroyed and goods are destroyed, it will be a good thing for the workers. This seems all clear enough, for it is an accepted notion that if only workers can get plenty of work and good pay, there can be nothing else for them to wish for. Yet somehow we can't help suspecting that there is a dropped chain somewhere in the reasoning; a cracked link somewhere in the chain of argument. Put on your thinking caps, friends, and try if you can think it out. We have an idea by the time a man thinks that he has a better and gets at the nub of this, he will have a true and better knowledge and understanding of political economy than have some of the professors who teach it in the colleges.

As men will not consent to pay (to meet

FROM THE LEHIGH COAL REGION.

Master Workman, Hugh McGarvey Decries the Situation—More Money Paid for Royalties Than is Paid Altogether to Miners—The Knowledge of the Remedy Spreading.

Mr. Hugh McGarvey of the Lehigh coal region, master workman of district assembly 87, K. of L., visited New York several days since to solicit aid for the sufferers from the late strike. In an interview with him a representative of THE STANDARD elicited some information which ought to give courage to single tax men all over the country. Mr. McGarvey said that the collieries were starting up as fast as possible, but that 700 of the men who had gone back to work had been blacklisted and discharged for having taken too active a part in the strike. "Not many new men had come into the region," said Mr. McGarvey, "because it was well known that public opinion was very strong against the interference of outsiders."

"What will become of the 700 men who have been discharged?" asked THE STANDARD.

"They will go elsewhere to seek work."

"Where will they go?"

"To the Schuylkill or Wyoming regions."

"Have not the Schuylkill and Wyoming collieries already a full quota of hands?"

"Yes, but men are always getting dissatisfied or discharged, and the idlers take their chances."

"What per cent of the whole number of miners does this shifting element constitute?"

"About one-third."

"Then for every two men who are at work there is practically always one idler standing by bidding for their places?"

"That is just it."

"Then the upshot of the whole business is that a miner can now dig coal in Pennsylvania only on the terms fixed by the owners of the coal mines?"

"That is exactly it, and the mine owners are making the terms worse every year."

"What, then, do the miners or their organizations propose to do about it?"

"Well, that is the question. The more intelligent knights are beginning to see the dog in the coal pit. They are beginning to see that, while labor organizations and strikes may and do check the encroachments of the mine owners on the mine workers, the miners will never be able to get all that they earn until the dog in the coal pit is routed out; that is, until any miner can dig coal, without asking the leave of any one, on the same terms as can Mr. Austin Corbin or Mr. Anybody else. There is no place in this world," continued Mr. McGarvey, "which so plainly points to the necessity of the common appropriation of land values by the single tax as the anthracite coal regions."

"Here are some facts which will show what I mean. The anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, which practically contain the entire supply of anthracite in the world, cover about 2,500 square miles. There are employed in mining this coal only something over one hundred thousand men and boys. The royalty paid to the owners who claim to own the mines amounts to more than the aggregate wages of all the mine workers. That is enough in itself to set the people thinking. Why, there is one firm, Cox Bros. & Co., who own thousands of acres of coal lands and lease thousands of acres more, who are now getting all the miners they want at about forty per cent of the current wages in other collieries. Men who have nothing to eat, who live in company houses, on company land, who haven't the means to take them away if they wanted to go, and wouldn't know where to go if they could get them, and who can't work a lick without the permission of the owner of everything above and beneath the surface of the ground, will work temporarily at least, for almost any price. There are many miners in that state of abject poverty that Messrs. Cox Bros. & Co. have little trouble in getting the services of some 4,000 mine workers on their own terms, and of course the effect is to more or less demoralize wages in all the collieries. The situation is very bad, but these strikes are educating the workers to see more plainly where the real trouble is."

The coal miners of the Lehigh region have made an appeal to the working people of the United States for relief of the victims of the late strike, and they request that all remittances be made to Mr. John J. Meighan, treasurer, Freeland, Pa.

Self-Evident Facts.

Philadelphia, Free Labor.

No argument can break down the fact that manufacturers could make cheaper goods and pay better wages if they could buy:

Cheaper wool.

Cheaper dyestuffs.

Cheaper paint.

Cheaper glue, lamp and flax.

Cheaper chemicals and other crude materials.

CERTAIN REASONS FOR PROTECTION.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

Chapter XV of Protection of Free Trade.

We have seen (in the preceding chapter) that low wages do not mean low cost of production, and that a high standard of wages, instead of putting a country at a disadvantage in production, is really an advantage. This disposes of the claim that protection is rendered necessary by high wages, by showing the invalidity of the first assumption upon which it is based, viz., that low wages mean low cost of production. But it is worth while to examine the second assumption in this claim—that production is determined by cost, so that a country of less advantages cannot produce if the free competition of a country of greater advantages be permitted. For while we are sometimes told that a country needs protection because of great natural advantages that ought to be developed, we are at other times told that protection is needed because of the sparseness of population, the want of capital, or machinery, or skill, or because of high taxes or a high rate of interest, (1) or other conditions which, it may be, involve real disadvantage.

But without reference to the reality of the alleged advantages, or disadvantage, all these special pleas for protection are met when it is shown, as it can be shown, that whatever be its advantages or disadvantages for production, a country always increases its wealth by foreign trade.

If we suppose two countries, each of which is, for any reason, at a decided disadvantage in some branch of production in which the other has a decided advantage, it is evident that the free exchange of commodities between them will be mutually beneficial, by enabling each to make up for its own disadvantage by availing itself of the advantage of the other, just as the blind man and the lame man did in the familiar story. Trade between them will give to each country a greater amount of all things than it could obtain by itself, and with the same quantity of labor. Such a case resembles that of two workmen, each having, as to some things, skill superior to the other, and who, by working together, each devoting himself to that part for which he is the better fitted, can accomplish more than twice as much as if each worked separately.

But let us suppose two countries, one of which has advantages superior to the other for all the productions of which both are capable. Trade between them being free, would one country do all the exporting and the other all the importing? That, of course, would be impossible. World trade, then, is impossible? Certainly not. Unless the people of the country of less advantages transferred themselves bodily to the country of greater advantages, trade would go on with mutual benefit. The people of the country of greater advantages would import from the country of less advantages those products as to which the difference of advantage between the two countries was least, and would export in return those products as to which the difference was greatest. By this exchange both peoples would gain. The people of the country of greater advantages would gain, since, by being saved the necessity of producing the things as to which their advantage was least, they could concentrate their energies upon the production of things in which their advantage was greatest. This case would resemble that of two workmen of different degrees of skill in all parts of their trade, or that of a skilled workman and an unskilled helper. Though the workman might be able to perform all parts of the work in less time than the helper, yet there would be some parts in which the advantage of his superior skill would be less than in others; and as by leaving these to the helper he could devote more time to those parts in which superior skill would be most effective, there would be, as in the former case, a mutual gain in their working together.

Thus it is that neither advantages nor disadvantages afford any reason for restricting trade. (2) Trade is always to the benefit of both parties. If it were not there would be no disposition to carry it on. And thus we see again the fallacy of the protectionist contention that if it takes more labor to produce a thing in our country than elsewhere, we shall lose nothing by shutting out the foreign product, even though we have to pay a higher price for the home product. The interchange of the products of labor does not depend upon differences of absolute cost, but of comparative cost. Goods may profitably be sent from places where they cost more labor to places where they cost less labor, provided (and this is the only case in which they even will be sent) that a still greater difference in labor cost exists as to other things which the first country desires to obtain. Thus tea, which Horace Greeley was fond of referring to as a production that might advantageously be naturalized in the United States by a heavy duty, could undoubtedly be produced in the United States at a less cost of labor than in China, for in transportation to the seaboard, packing, etc., we could save upon Chinese methods. But there are other things, such as the mining of silver, the refining of oil, the weaving of cloth, the making of clocks and watches, as to which our advantage over the Chinese is enormously greater than in the growing of tea. Hence, by producing these things and exchanging them directly or indirectly for Chinese tea, we obtain, in spite of the long carriage, more tea for the same labor than we could get by growing our own tea.

(3) The higher rate of interest in the United States than in Great Britain has until recently been one of the stock reasons of American protectionists for demanding a high tariff. We do not hear much of this now, but the rate in New York is as low as in London, if not lower, but we hear no less of the need for protection. It is hardly necessary in this discussion to treat of the nature and law of interest, a subject which I have gone over in "Progress and Poverty." It may, however, be worth while to say that a high rate of interest where it does not proceed from insecurity, is not to be regarded as a disadvantage, but rather as evidence of the large returns to the active factors of production—labor and capital—returns which diminish as rent rises and the land owner gets a larger share of their produce for permitting labor and capital to work.

(4) In point of fact there is no country which is so far behind in production as to be unable to have superior advantages. The conditions which make one part of the habitable globe better fitted for some productions than for others, and what is disadvantageous for one, is an advantage for another. The conditions which make some parts of the globe useless to man may, if invention ever succeeds in directly utilizing the power of the sun's rays, be found to be especially advantageous for certain parts of production. The advantages and disadvantages that come from the varying density of population, the special development of certain forms of industry, etc., are also largely relative. The most positive of all advantages in production is that which most certainly gives superiority in all branches, is that which arises from that general intelligence which increases with the increase of the comfort and leisure of the masses of the people; that is to say, with the increase of wages.

Consider how this principle, that the interchange of commodities is governed by the comparative, not the absolute, cost of production, applies to the plea that protective duties are required on account of home taxation. It is, of course, true that a special tax placed upon any branch of production puts it at a disadvantage unless the like tax is placed upon the importation of similar productions. But this is not true of such general taxation as falls on all branches of industry alike. As such taxation does not alter the comparative profitability of industries, it does not diminish the relative inducement to carry any of them on, and to protect any particular industry from foreign competition on account of such general taxation is simply to enable those engaged in it to throw off their share of a general burden.

A favorite assumption of American protectionists, or rather has been (for we once heard much more of it than now), that free trade is a good thing for rich countries but a bad thing for poor countries—that it enables a country of better developed industries to prevent the development of industry in other countries, and to make such countries tributary to itself. But it follows from the principle which, as we have seen, causes and governs international exchanges, that for any country to impose restrictions on its foreign commerce on account of its own disadvantages in production is to prevent such advantages as those disadvantages as foreign trade would bring. Free trade is voluntary trade. It cannot go on unless to the advantage of both parties, and, as between the two, free trade is relatively more advantageous to the poor and undeveloped country than to the rich and prosperous country. The opening up of trade between a Robinson Crusoe and the rest of the world would be to the advantage of both parties. But relatively the advantage would be far greater to Robinson Crusoe than to the rest of the world.

There is a certain class of American protectionists who concede that free trade is good in itself, but who say that we cannot safely adopt it until all other nations have adopted it, or until all other nations have come up to our standard of civilization; or, as it is sometimes phrased, until the millennium has come, and men have ceased to struggle for their own interests as opposed to the interests of others. And so British protectionists have now assumed the name of "Fair Traders." They have ceased to deny the essential goodness of free trade, but contend that so long as other countries maintain protective tariffs Great Britain, in self-defense, should maintain a protective tariff, at least against countries that refuse to admit British productions free.

The fallacy underlying most of these American excuses for protection is that considered in the previous chapter—the fallacy that the country of low wages can undersell the country of high wages; but there is also mixed with this the notion to which the British fair traders appeal—the notion that the abolition of duties by any country is to the advantage, not of the people of that country, but of the people of the other countries, that are thus given free access to its markets. "Is not the fact that British manufacturers desire the abolition of our protective tariff a proof that we ought to continue it?" ask American protectionists. "Is it not a suicidal policy to give foreigners free access to our markets while they refuse us access to theirs?" cry British fair traders.

All these notions are forms of the delusion that to export is more profitable than to import, but so widespread and influential are they that it may be well to devote a few words to them. The direct effect of a tariff is to restrain the people of the country that imposes it. It curtails the freedom of foreigners to trade, only through its operation in curtailing the freedom of citizens to trade. So far as foreigners are concerned, it only indirectly affects their freedom to trade with that particular country, while to citizens of that country it is a direct curtailment of the freedom to trade with all the world. Since trade involves mutual benefit, it is true that any restriction that prevents one party from trading must operate in some degree to the injury of another party. But the indirect injury which a protective tariff inflicts upon other countries is diffused and slight as compared with the injury it inflicts directly upon the nation that imposes it.

To illustrate: The tariff which we have so long maintained upon iron, to prevent our people from exchanging their products for British iron, has unquestionably lessened our trade with Great Britain. But the effect upon the United States has been very much more injurious than the effect upon Great Britain. While it has lessened our trade absolutely, it has lessened the trade of Great Britain only with us. What Great Britain has lost in this curtailment of her trade with us she has largely made up in the consequent extension of her trade elsewhere. For the effect of duties on iron and iron ore, and of the system of which they are part, has been so to increase the cost of American productions as to give to Great Britain the greater part of the carrying trade of the world, for which we were her principal competitor, and to which our States have been very much more injurious than the effect upon Great Britain and of other countries, of which, but for this, we should have had the largest share.

And in the same way for any nation to restrict the freedom of its own citizens to trade, because other nations so restrict the freedom of their citizens, is a policy of the "biting one's nose to spite one's face" order. Other nations may injure us by the imposition of taxes which tend to impoverish their own citizens, for as denizens of the world, it is to our real interest that all other denizens of the world should be prosperous. But no other nation can injure us so much as we shall injure ourselves if we impose similar taxes upon our own citizens by way of retaliation. Suppose that a farmer who has an improved variety of potatoes learns that a neighbor has wheat of such superior kind that it will yield many more bushels to the acre than that he has been sowing. He might naturally go to his neighbor and offer to exchange seed potatoes for seed wheat. But if the neighbor, while willing to sell the wheat, should refuse to buy the potatoes, would not our farmer be a fool to declare, "Since you will not buy my superior potatoes I will not buy your superior wheat?" Would it not be very stupid retaliation for him to go on planting poorer seed and getting poorer crops?

Or, suppose, isolated from the rest of mankind, half a dozen men so situated and so engaged that mutual convenience constantly prompts them to exchange productions with one another. Suppose five of these six to be under the dominion of some curious superstition which leads them when they receive anything in exchange to burn one-half of it up before carrying home the other half. This would indirectly be to the injury of the sixth man, because by lessening their own wealth his five neighbors would lessen their ability to exchange with him. But would he better himself if he were to say: "Since these fools will insist upon burning half of all they get in exchange I must, in self-defense, follow their example and burn half of all I get?"

The constitution and scheme of things in this world in which we find ourselves for a few years is such that no one can do either good or evil for himself alone. No one can release himself from the influence of his surroundings, and say, "What others do is nothing to me; nor yet can any one say, 'What I do is nothing to others.' Nevertheless it is

in the tendency of things that he who does good most profits by it, and he who does evil injures most of all himself. And those who say that a nation should adopt a policy essentially bad because other nations have embraced it are as unwise as those who say, 'Lie, because others are lazy; Refuse knowledge, because others are ignorant.'

HOW I FELT THE CAT.

BAY SHORE, L. I.—Seeing the cat with me is not a recent discovery. My first glimpse of it was obtained many years ago from the writers of the Hebrew scriptures, wherein the selling of land is forbidden and its usufruct tenure clearly inculcated. The animal was still more distinctly revealed to me when, as a student of law, Blackstone's "Commentaries on English Law" was put into my hands with admonition to make myself thoroughly conversant with it as the highest authority on the fundamental principles of English law. In this book I read as follows: "There is no foundation in nature or in natural law why a set of words upon parchment should convey the domain of land, why the son should have a right to exclude his fellow creatures from a determinate spot of ground because his father had done so before him, or why the occupier of a particular field, when lying upon his death bed and no longer able to maintain possession, should be entitled to tell the rest of the world what of them should enjoy it after him."

In confirmation of the ancient lawgiver and of the more recent law expounder came the testimony of the most profound philosopher of our age—Herbert Spencer. His "Social Statics" placed the fallacy in so bright a light that no part of its anatomy now remains in shadow. It only remained for the author of "Progress and Poverty" to show the world how easily and peacefully the hateful fiction can be got rid of.

But what I commenced to say was, not how I saw the cat, but how I felt it. It happened in this way: Having occasion to use a very small piece of that land that religion, philosophy, and reason unite in saying is, like the air and sunshine, the right of every person born into existence, I found, as all find who seek to utilize their natural right, that such a piece of land is to be had only by paying the way to unshod land there stood a person called a landlord. This lord of land replied to my inquiry—on what terms he would permit me to use what natural law says belongs to me in common with other men—"I don't wish to sell this piece of land or any of my land, because it will in a few years be worth a great deal more than it now is; but as I don't want to use it myself I will lease it to you for five years, and at the expiration of that term you can have the privilege of re-lease it at the increased value which it may then have. This is to say, after my improvements and those of my neighbors should have added to the value of this piece of land I should have the privilege of paying my landlord for what I and they have done."

Such a proposition would be considered decidedly cool if made in reference to any other species of property, but from a lord of land it is regarded as all right, and not to have made it would have shown him to be not alive to his opportunities.

Well, the result was that for the use only of less than one-tenth of an acre of ground which was used in growing wheat, I was forced to pay annually three times the sum for which a whole acre could have been bought in fee simple less than thirty years ago. This is how I felt the cat and how I will continue to feel him more and more as time goes on. Is it any wonder then that I don't love the cat and that I have determined never to rest satisfied until his claws are cut and his teeth drawn, that the coming generations of men shall not suffer from his rapacity as the present and past generations have?

HUGH B. BROWN.

A Worker in the Cause.

Mr. C. Hardin of Coatescook, N. H., is doing efficient work for the cause of industrial emancipation. In a series of letters to the *Keystone Independent* and *Times* of Warner, N. H., he is telling some home truths about tariff plunder and land monopoly, and has succeeded in compelling the advocates of the protective idea to rush into print and aid the cause of freedom by illustrating the weakness of the arguments against it. The extracts which we print below will give an idea of Mr. Hardin's work. He is making the *Independent* and *Times* a mighty interesting paper.

Americans should not forget that free trade is free trade. Freedom in our commercial relations is just as important as freedom in other things, and should be guaranteed by our government as much as our freedom in other things. A trade is an exchange of something which is of less value to us for that which is of greater value. This is true for both parties to the trade. It is a part of a man's liberty to be permitted to make such a transaction, and the more frequently and freely the better. So-called "protection" is an interference with this principle. It adds to the gains of one class, but it compels other classes to pay the difference. It is a wedge driven horizontally through society which, while it elevates some, pushes others down just as much and separates the individuals and interests of a country whose welfare and strength depend upon their being united.

We hear it said that practice, not theory, should decide the question. Well it is already decided before our eyes. The different states of the United States have no "protection" from each other and there is no tariff on goods brought from one state into another, yet New England farmers need just as much protection from the "rich grain fields of the west as New England manufacturers do from the 'pauper labor of Europe.'"

... Of all things, land lies at the bottom. The essence of slavery lies in the monopolization of the land by private ownership. Chattel slavery could never have existed without private ownership of land as a basis. The name has been given to ownership of persons, but the real thing belongs to private ownership of land. We have pretty well learned in this country the iniquity of the one; to learn the still greater iniquity of the other is our next lesson.

The Speculator's Prayer.

NEW YORK.—I wish to call attention to a remark which I heard at last Saturday's prayer meeting in John street. When opportunity was afforded for general remarks at the close of the services, a gentleman arose hurriedly saying that he had come to the meeting to thank God for helping him out of his business troubles. He had speculated and had succeeded beyond all expectations. He cared not what might be said of this, as he believed, after prayerful meditation, that it was just as legitimate to hold grain in bulk in Chicago as it was to hold land on the prairies, and he wanted the prayers of all present that he might make a proper use of this blessing of God. At this there seemed to flash through the audience a sensation of pious admiration and prayerfulness, but there was no criticism of the logic of his remarks, though more than one minister of the Gospel was present. SAMUEL WILLIAMS.

JOHN AND HIS MASTER.

Canadian "Tracts of the Times."

John was an employee in a Canadian factory. His fortune was about the same as that of most factory operatives, which is not saying much, for by the time he paid for his food, fuel, shelter, clothing and the maintenance of his wife and three children, the margin for savings against a rainy day was narrow enough. His employer, whom we will call Thomas Jenks, esq., enjoyed a fortune far and flourishing. He owned not only the Lowville mills, but was director in a bank, director also on a railroad board and member of the Canadian parliament. His fortune had for some years stood among the sixes, and some people hinted that it was rapidly approaching the sevens.

Now the Canadian government has assumed the paternity of all the citizens, with the promise that prosperity would be guaranteed if only the politicians were allowed to adjust the mechanism of society. I want you, therefore, to note how the benighted parliament looked after the affairs of John and also those of Thomas Jenks, esq.

Jenks bought cotton, and so did John, only with this difference: Jenks bought it by the bale, before it had been woven into cloth; while John bought it by the yard, after it had been woven into cloth. When Jenks bought his cotton the government of paternity allowed him to buy wherever he pleased, and no duty was imposed when he imported. He was allowed to purchase wherever he could get the cheapest. But, besides buying cotton, Thomas Jenks, esq., also bought machinery, and this also was allowed to obtain wherever he could buy it at the lowest rate. Further than that, the paternal government assisted him to get that labor at the lowest possible figure; for he sent emigrant agents to get laborers where they were in greatest abundance. Hence the rule adopted by this paternity for Thomas Jenks, esq., was freedom, abundance and cheapness. It not only allowed him to buy in the cheapest market, it actually assisted him so to do. If there was any advantage in free trade the parliament took good care that Thomas Jenks, esq., should enjoy that advantage to the full.

Now let us see how this same parliament exercised its paternal functions toward John. When with his scanty wages he went to purchase, the cotton manufacturers at Manchester offered him for his dollar so many yards, and the manufacturers at Lowell so many yards, and the manufacturers at Canada so many yards. Now here were three groups of manufacturers bidding against each other for that dollar. Was John allowed to accept the highest bid—to accept the greatest number of yards—to buy where he could buy the cheapest? Not by any means. No. John had to undergo a course of education on the "where" of spending money. A line of pickets was thrown round him to watch that he did not let that dollar slip out of the country, and if he had attempted so to do, at once a large portion of that dollar would have been confiscated to teach him better manners than to think of buying where he pleased. Freedom for John was dangerous, cheapness was destructive, and the abundant market was a delusion to beguile the simple.

The kind and paternal parliament then undertook the education of John in the art of buying, and was to him if he does not heed the lesson and ventures beyond the prescribed precincts. No more carefully is a drove of sheep guarded by the faithful collier than John is guarded by the customs picket to protect him from—what? Abundance, cheapness and freedom!

So much for the buying. Let us examine the selling, for both John and his rich master Thomas Jenks, esq., sell. John sells his labor, while Mr. Jenks sells goods, and in doing so both have to submit to the laws of supply and demand, and the laws of competition. But when you want to know how the government of paternity acts toward John and toward Jenks. When John sells, he must submit to sell in competition with the whole world. The buyers of labor can draw their supply from any quarter of the globe, without let or hindrance. Should John demand wages higher than are paid in New Hampshire or Massachusetts, in a day or two Jenks can draw a supply from that country. Hence John must submit to the full batch of unrestricted competition. Should a fresh batch of immigrants come seeking employment, and offer to work for lower wages, John must submit to the competition of the new and most soulless and conscienceless of all tyrants.

ALBERT WALKLEY.

MISS AGATHA MUNIER IS NOW forming classes for instruction in vocal sight reading for ladies and gentlemen, as well as in solo singing in all its branches, and in elocution. For terms, etc., address MISS MUNIER, 223 East Thirty-second street, New York.

CHARLES B. SCHMIDNER, PHOTOGRAPHER, 223 Third Avenue, cor. 12th street, New York. Children's Photographs by instantaneous process a specialty.

COOGAN BROS. 125 COOGAN BROS. 121

COOGAN BROS. CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS, COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

NOTICE.—Who believe that the public revenue should be raised by a single and direct tax upon real and personal property, are requested to send their names and addresses to SAMUEL WILLIAMS, Vincennes, Ind.

PRINTING. CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (INC.) 47 and 49 Center st., N. Y.

BOOK, JOB AND NEWSPAPER PRINTING.

BRIGGS' PIANOS. BRIGGS & CO. 5 APPLETON ST. BOSTON, MASS. MANUFACTURERS OF GRAND SQUARE AND UPRIGHT PIANO-PORTES.

GRACEFUL DESIGN—SOLID CONSTRUCTION—MATCHLESS TONE—BEAUTIFUL FINISH.

UNITY CONGREGATION.

REV. HUGH O. PENTECOST,

MINISTER.

MASONIC HALL.

Sixth Avenue and Twenty-third street.

SERVICES.

Sunday Morning, 11 o'clock.

UNITY CIRCLE.

Musical and dramatic entertainment for the benefit of the

UNITY CONGREGATION.

MONDAY EVENING, March 25, MASONIC TEMPLE, 631 street and 6th Ave.

Reserved seats, 50 cents. Unreserved, 25 cents.

MUSCELLANEOUS.

SUITS TO ORDER FROM \$13.50.

PANTS TO ORDER FROM \$3.50.

Samples and self-measuring chart (mailed on application) by stating price and as near as possible design desired.

BRAHAM'S.

212 BOWERY, NEW YORK CITY.

THOUSANDS OF THE BEST

\$38 GOLD WATCH

EVER MADE ARE SELLING IN THE

CO-OPERATIVE CLUBS.

This is the Best, Cheapest, Most Convenient.

And only Co-operative System of selling watches.

The watches are American Lever Stem Winders, containing every essential to accuracy and durability, and have, in addition, numerous patented improvements found in no other watch. They are absolutely the only *Dust and Damp Proof* Movements made in the world, and are jeweled throughout with *GENUINE RUBIES*. The *Patent Stem Wind* and *Patent* is the most simple and made. They are fully equal for appearance, accuracy, durability and service, to any \$75 watch.

Our Co-operative Club System brings them within the reach of every one.

We want an active, responsible representative in EVERY CITY and TOWN.

Heavy profits guaranteed on limited investment. Write for full particulars.

The Keystone Watch Club Co.

P. O. Box 928, Philadelphia, Pa.

AGENTS:—Keystone National Bank, or any Commercial Agency.

New York, N. Y.: Hartington, Pa. Chicago, Ill.: Bessner, Co. Philadelphia, Pa.: Bessner, Co. Boston, Mass.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. New Orleans, La.: Bessner, Co. San Francisco, Cal.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. Baltimore, Md.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Cleveland, O.: Bessner, Co. Detroit, Mich.: Bessner, Co. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bessner, Co. Cincinnati, O.: Bessner, Co. St. Louis, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Kansas City, Mo.: Bessner, Co. Omaha, Neb.: Bessner, Co. St. Paul, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bessner, Co. Portland, Me.: Bessner, Co. New Haven, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Hartford, Conn.: Bessner, Co. Albany, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Syracuse, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Rochester, N. Y.: Bessner, Co. Buffalo, N. Y.: B